1983

Factors Associated With Housing Satisfaction, Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area, 1983 (Louisiana).

Donlene Ann mcdonald Butler
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Butler, Donlene Ann McDonald

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH HOUSING SATISFACTION GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical Col. ED.D. 1983

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH HOUSING SATISFACTION

GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA

1983

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree

of
Doctor of Education

in

The Department of Extension and
International Education

by

Donlene Ann McDonald Butler
B.S., University of Southwestern Louisiana, 1962
M.S., Louisiana State University, 1968
May, 1983

DEDICATION

This manuscript is lovingly dedicated to my family,

My husband, Dennis

and

My sons, Dennis, Jr., Dean, and Donald

for

Their love, support and understanding throughout this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Acknowledgements

The researcher wishes to express gratitude to Director Denver Loupe and the Cooperative Extension Service for the opportunity for graduate study.

Special thanks go to Mr. Bobby Fletcher, Associate District Agent, and Dr. Buck Greene, Associate Director, for recommending and approving study leaves.

Grateful appreciation is also expressed to Dr. J. H. Jones, Jr., Professor of Sociology and Extension Education, for his assistance and guidance as major professor and graduate committee chairman.

Deep gratitude is extended to each member of the author's graduate committee: Dr. Bruce Flint, Professor of Extension Education; Dr. Satish Verma, Associate Professor of Extension Education; Dr. Barbara Holt, Associate Professor of Vocational Home Economics Education; Dr. Gladys Hildreth, Professor of Family Life and Environment; Dr. Lisandro O. Perez, Associate Professor of Sociology; and Dr. Edward Gassie, Professor and Head, Department of Extension and International Education, for their encouragement and guidance during this study.

Sincere appreciation is also extended to each of the members of the Plaquemines Parish Extension Service staff for their assistance and encouragement during graduate study

particularly to my secretary, Mrs. Mary de Sambourg for special help and assistance.

Special thanks to my parents, Mrs. Beulah McDonald and the late Michael Donald McDonald for their love and support during my education, and to my sister Kathy Doucet and her husband Johnny for their help and encouragement.

Extra special thanks to my family for their love, concern, understanding, encouragement, time and energy put forth during my graduate program. To my husband, Dennis, for assistance with collection of data, tabulation, computer assistance, statistical calculations, and the measure of encouragement I so desperately needed; to my son, Dennis, Jr., for assistance in computer programming and statistical calculations; to my son, Donald, for assistance in proof reading and collation, and especially to my son, Dean, for the endless hours spent in typing the manuscript and in computer assistance, a very special thank you.

Abstract

One of the more important aspects of most persons lives concerns the house in which they live. It is generally concurred an American goal is to have a "decent home and suitable living environment."

The major purpose of the study was to determine factors associated with housing satisfaction. Housing satisfaction was related to selected characteristics of the residence, selected physical aspects of the dwelling, selected economic aspects of the dwelling, and to obtain selected data about housing as a basis for planning future educational programs.

Data for this study were obtained through conducting telephone interviews with a prepared interview schedule. If respondents were unable to participate in the telephone interview they were presented a choice of completing a questionnaire by mail.

The chi-square test was used to test for statistical significance of difference between selected variables concerning various aspects of the housing situation and overall housing satisfaction. The results were determined to be significant at the .05 level of probability. Percentages, frequency distributions and arithmetic means were calculated where appropriate.

Some of the factors found to be associated with more overall housing satisfaction were:

Respondents very satisfied with storage for food, kitchen equipment, linens, drugs and cosmetics, regularly worn hanging clothes, outdoor recreation equipment, indoor recreation equipment, seasonal items, laundry supplies, and yard care equipment were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Residence which met family's needs led to "more satisfaction"	$P < .01$
Satisfaction with residence when entertaining led to "more satisfaction"	$P < .01$
Residence in good condition led to "more satisfaction"	$P < .01$
Residents who maintained their home very well were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Respondents with guest bedrooms were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Respondents with only one bedroom were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Home owners were "more satisfied" than renters	$P < .01$
Living in residence a longer period of time contributed to "more satisfaction"	$P < .01$
Respondents with older children were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Households without children were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$
Older respondents were "more satisfied"	$P < .01$

CHAPTER I

Introduction

A home is a reflection of the total family. It is an extension of each member's personality, wants, desires, needs, and accomplishments. It also has the effect of molding their lives. Winston Churchill is credited with saying, "We shape our buildings and then our buildings shape us" (Lewis, P. 9). The amount of space, color, noise, privacy or lack of it, all affect one's feelings, emotions, and outlook on life. Our social life and friendships are influenced by where people live.

Statement of Problem

The national housing goal of a "decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" was established by the United States Congress through the 1949 Housing Act, was reaffirmed in 1968, and again in 1974 (Greendale, et al., P.v). However, the ultimate goal of most American families--to own their own home--has become increasingly difficult to realize in recent years as inflation has increased the price of housing more rapidly than family incomes. The median price of single-family homes in the United States increased 173 percent between 1971 and 1981 from $25,000 to an estimated $68,000 (NAHB, 1982, P.6). By November, 1982 the median price had risen another

seven percent to $74,200 ("Specs," January, 1983, P.96). Median family incomes from 1971 to 1981 increased from $20,939 to $21,071 only one percent (Census, P.436).

Cost of building materials had been increasing, but in the past few years, costs have been increasing so rapidly builders have a difficult time quoting bids. Land prices are pushing up constantly and interest rates have climbed steadily.

Herman J. Smith, President of the National Association of Home Builders, in speaking to the American Association of Housing Educators at the annual 1981 conference, referred to the 18 percent interest rates for 1981 (Smith, Herman, P.6). This 18 percent rate was an increase of 8.9 percent from the 9.1 percent rate in January, 1978 (Time, P. 66). Interest rates nearly doubled in the three years from 1978 to 1981. Even with the decline, in early 1983 to 10.5 percent for FHA-VA loans and 11.5 to 12.5 percent for conventional loans, it was still difficult for most families to meet such high mortgage payments (Sumichrest, P. 4).

Governmental regulations, particularly zoning requirements and red tape of local governments, can increase the cost of a house 33 percent according to a study conducted by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (Stuart, P.4). These factors combined have contributed to the rise in the cost of housing for the American family.

Through the years families have demanded that more amenities be included in their new home. As Brekenfeld reports, in 1950 the median new single-family home was of 894 square feet and typically contained two bedrooms, one bath, no garage, and very few built-in appliances or other amenities. In 1974, the median floor space of new homes was 1,560 square feet, or 74 percent larger. It typically contained three bedrooms, two baths, a two-car garage, and numerous built-in appliances and other amenities (Brekenfeld, P.84). By November of 1976, the National Association of Home Builders issued a report stating that the median-sized new home consisted of 1,615 square feet and by 1979 the median size had increased to 1,760 square feet. Since 1979, however, the median size decreased to 1,595 square feet in 1981 (NAHB, P.2, P.20).

Added to the increased costs of purchasing housing were the increased costs of home ownership such as utilities, taxes, legal fees, and maintenance and repairs. The cost of these services increased more rapidly than purchase prices of homes (Wall Street Journal, 1977).

The desire for home ownership remained. From July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976, the National Association of Home Builders conducted a survey of nearly 1,000 home owners purchasing housing during that time. The most prevalent

reason for making a purchase was the "desire for ownership" (NAHB, 1976). Gretchen Bayler found the "desire for ownership" was the greatest single reason stated for purchasing a home by 90 percent of the respondents in the study she conducted in Virginia in 1977 (Bayler, P.112).

Even though the desire is great, the ultimate goal is becoming increasingly difficult to attain financially, so many families are making alternative choices. Some are choosing to rent as a permanent solution; others are renting temporarily until a down payment can be saved through a second income in the family; while some are settling for smaller, older or less expensive homes with smaller down payments or those with fewer amenities (Bayler,119). Townhouses, condominiums and mobile homes are the choices of others seeking less expensive housing. Many families remodel their present dwelling, while still others can only afford minor changes in their present home to make it more satisfactory to meet their families' needs.

Housing is a complicated concern, not only because of the financial implications to the consumer's life, but because most housing-related choices and activities require interaction with government, industry, and community. For example, housing choices involve all of the procedural or legal transactions required for occupancy (water hook-up, lease, recording of deed). Further, a housing consumer is

involved in many on-going stages: a) choice (selection or planning); b) acquisition; c) utilization; d) maintenance (care, upkeep, remodeling, and renovation); and e) unoccupancy and disposal. Each of these stages is complex, and because circumstances change, all households are continually involved with one or more of these stages--often several of them simultaneously (Wells, P.1).

The complexity of housing, the large financial investment, and the social interactions and psychological well-being that housing holds for the family dictate that special consideration be given to housing education for the general public.

The philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service has always been to plan educational programs to meet people's needs. It is necessary therefore, to identify problems facing today's families to accomplish this goal. Extension Home Economists need insight into the specific problems facing families today as they seek adequate, satisfactory housing.

Brophy stated that housing satisfaction is the result of subjective evaluation of the degree to which housing needs are met (Brophy, P.268). As the Extension Home Economist determines factors associated with housing satisfaction it will be possible to determine the degree to which the family's housing needs are met. With this

information, a program of work can be designed to be used in teaching housing and home furnishings to families. Programs can be planned to fill the gap between the present knowledge of selected housing concepts attained by the families, and the additional knowledge they feel is needed in fulfilling their housing needs.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of the study was to determine factors associated with housing satisfaction. Data were collected on the characteristics of the house. The length of residence, housing tenure, type, size and value of the house were determined. Special attention was given to the storage in the house. Characteristics of the family including size, composition, sex, age, education, occupation, income and housing expenditures were determined. The family was asked to rate the condition and maintenance of the house, the adequacy of the storage, adequacy of the house for entertaining, and whether the house met the family's needs. Each respondent was asked if they were well satisfied with their house. The characteristics of house and family were compared to the satisfaction level to determine which factors were associated with housing satisfaction.

The study was conducted to determine any future plans the family had for altering the housing situation, the knowledge of housing concepts attained by the respondent,

the expressed needs for additional information on these concepts, and the most practical methods of receiving housing information.

Objectives of Study

The major objective of the study was to determine the relationship of housing and family factors associated with housing satisfaction.

Other sub-objectives were:

1.) To compile data relative to the size, type and condition of homes occupied by families in the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area.

2.) To determine the total monthly costs of housing.

3.) To determine whether or not present housing situations meet needs and requirements of families.

4.) To identify families' short and long term plans to improve or alter their housing.

5.) To examine the composition, characteristics and life styles of the families.

6.) To determine the families' present levels of knowledge of selected housing concepts and the manners in which they obtained this knowledge.

7.) To obtain families' expressed needs for receiving additional information on selected housing concepts.

8.) To establish the educational methods most preferred by families to obtain additional housing information.

9.) To utilize knowledge gained about family characteristics, present housing situations, desired changes in housing situation, present knowledge of selected housing concepts, expressed needs for additional information and preferred methods of receiving that additional housing information to formulate implications for educational programs in housing.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Since the desire for home ownership is great but the current economic situation is curtailing its accomplishment, families may not be satisfied with their housing situations.

Literature has been reviewed to take a look at the needs housing fills for the family, their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their present residence, desired features in a residence, housing tenure, the problems families are facing in meeting these needs, alternatives available, and the role the Cooperative Extension Service can perform to enable families to meet these needs.

Man's Need for Housing

For man to survive in his environment, he must meet three basic needs--for food, clothing and shelter. Shelter is literally all that housing provides in some societies, but for most Americans, shelter from the elements and protection from enemies are a minor aspect of housing.

The complexity of our society and the tremendous advances in science not only permit, but also require, man's shelter to be much more than protection against the elements. It must satisfy his economic, social and psychological needs as well (Beyer, P.vii).

Abraham Maslow in Motivation and Personality discussed the human personality and the needs that motivate it. He described five basic needs: physiological needs, safety or security needs, social needs, self-esteem or ego needs, and self-actualization needs. Housing plays a role in satisfying each of these needs. It provides shelter from the elements to meet physical needs, but it also provides protection from other individuals, thus it meets safety needs. Homes provide space to perform every-day relationships with others, meeting social needs. Self-esteem or ego needs are met through the aesthetic value of homes. Self-actualization can be achieved when the home offers a way to pursue individual interests.

Maslow explained that these needs are related and that a lower need must be partially satisfied before a higher need becomes potent. Most people are partially satisfied and partially dissatisfied in all their basic needs. It is only when a lower need is not satisfied or insufficiently satisfied that higher needs do not appear (Maslow, P.80-92).

A number of studies have reflected upon the relationship of housing to fulfill man's needs. As Pond studied the effects of housing on health, he remarked, "Housing is not simply bricks and mortar. It is the complex of shelter and people, interrelated and mutually important" (Pond, P.671).

Schorr pointed out that there exists a cause-effect relationship of the close environment (the home) with the individual residing there. This relationship can be studied from the aspects of: (1) the effect of housing when it is viewed as a symbolic extension of one's self, as a factor in increasing/minimizing stress, and as a factor in feelings of satisfaction; (2) the effects of physical housing on privacy, child-rearing practices, housekeeping, or study habits by its space, state of repair, facilities and arrangement; and, (3) the effects of neighborhood or its relationships to the rest of the city (Schorr, P. 31).

Angell addressed the effect housing played in fulfilling needs by stating,

> "Housing is the physical and social setting in which man's needs may be fulfilled. Furthermore, it can be seen that housing may be conditioned by man and, in turn, it may affect his welfare and well-being through encouraging or limiting need fulfillment" (Angell, 1972, P.7).

Smith, et al., emphasized the social need a home fills in setting family living patterns.

> The priorities granted to privacy and interaction within the family dwelling are resultants of the family's patterns. Equally important, yet often overlooked, is the role of the dwelling in encouraging or inhibiting the desired priorities. The house, as the physical environment in which the ebb and flow of family development takes place, may well play an assertive though silent, part in the establishment of family living patterns through the accommodations for privacy and interaction which it provides (Smith, P.559).

Part of fulfilling needs is the relationships within the dwelling. The dwelling plays a vital role in influencing these relationships.

According to Wagner, Patricia Carbine, publisher and editor-in-chief of MS Magazine, addressed this topic,

> "We are finished with the idea that the house is primarily the responsibility of the woman. As women we have reached the point where we understand and want to share with our families the understanding that the place where we live is the place where we all live and where we are all responsible. The duties performed in the house are not the function of helping the women, but of helping each other in a shared way literally taking on the responsibility for the running of that dwelling; and I think to approach the whole question of the future with any other notion is exactly wrong" (Wagner, P.97).

Lynda Simmons, executive vice-president and director of development for Phipps House, a non-profit philanthropic corporation which provides model housing at moderate cost for moderate-and low-income families, is designing housing in accord with contemporary society. According to Wagner she stated,

> "I would like to make an ideological point--I think for me as an architect, a feminist, and a developer with some influence over this process, my goal is to create housing that will allow individuals--men, women and children--to fulfill themselves. I don't think in terms of 'What does the woman need ?' What I am interested in is, how can we create dwelling units in which the people who live in them share the responsibilities? How can we design physical arrangements which don't interfere with that sharing and don't create second-class-citizen status for the women and girls. For instance, what is wrong with interior kitchens, which are black holes of Calcutta, is that the men won't go there. If women think that

> men are ever going to take over their share of the household, we have to eliminate things that create inequities in social relations, and thereby, interfere with social relations. The stereotype kitchen is the separated kitchen; the stereotype person is the one who is supposed to go in there and work" (Wagner, P.97).

Homes do set the pace for the establishment of family living patterns. If individuals continue interacting in stereotyped dwellings, will they meet the needs of changing social and cultural roles?

Paolucci outlined eleven basic needs that housing fills for the family: (1) physical needs,(2) psychological needs, (3) need for safety,(4) need for identity,(5) need for love, (6) need for independence,(7) need for stimulation and variety, (8) social needs,(9) need to belong,(10) spiritual needs, and (11) need for self-fulfillment (Paolucci, P. 273-276).

Back addressed the question in noting that people see their homes as an extension of themselves. Their home and their lifestyle or social interaction within their home shapes and determines the view they have of their place in the community, their role, status and lifestyle (Back, P.3).

To help individuals meet their needs and fulfill their roles, a study of the environment becomes necessary. Doxiadis, the Greek architect-planner, proposed that ekistics, the study of environment or human settlements, be considered a science. His justification was that:

1. Man, apart from other animal species, maximizes his potential contacts with nature (water and trees), other people, and with the works of man.

2. Man minimizes the effort required for the achievement of these actual and potential contacts as evidenced by routes (highways) or structures.

3. Man optimizes protective space such that contacts with other persons, animals, or objects can be made without any kind of sensory or psychological discomfort.

4. Man optimizes his relationships with the elements of his environment: nature, society, shells (buildings, houses), and networks (roads to telecommunications). This principle leads to order, physiological and aesthetic, and in turn, influences architecture and art.

5. Man organizes his settlements to achieve an optimal synthesis of the other four principles. This organization depends on time and space, actual conditions, and man's ability.

As Doxiadis saw it, man is able to maximize his potential contacts with minimum effort, protecting himself from other undesirable contacts, and enjoy the desirable aspects of his environment once he has his microenvironment or his home established. This establishment, depending upon his time, space, actual conditions, and his own ability, leads to meeting his physiological and aesthetic needs. It becomes a "succussful human settlement", one with a balance between man and his man-made environment (Doxiadis, P.393-394).

Man, apart from other animal species, establishes an

environment which maximizes his contacts with nature, people and works of man with minimum effort, protecting himself from discomfort arising from these contacts. He organizes a balance between himself and his man-made environment to meet the basic needs the environment or the house fills. "Successful human settlements," the house, sets the pace for family living patterns. There is a cause-effect relationship to the close environment and the individuals living there, sharing duties and interacting together. The success of the environment depends upon time, space, actual conditions and man's own ability.

Housing Satisfaction or Dissatisfaction

A number of the studies reviewed considered the satisfaction or dissatisfaction that individuals feel toward their houses and the manner this affects the family.

Mathieu expressed "goodness of fit" as the degree to which housing matched the lifestyle of elderly individuals studied.

Goodness of fit has several facets:

1) the closeness of the person's actual living situation to what he considers the ideal living situation,

2) the extent to which his living situation allows the pursuit of self-fulfilling activity, and

3) the extent to which his actual living situation is congruent with his personally

> articulated needs and preferences (Mathieu, P.156).

Downer's study suggested that attitudes or feelings held about one's house may influence the social activity that one initiates or encourages in the house (Downer, P. 21).

Morris and Winter pointed out that the family's present and future needs, whether they own or rent their home, social norms and standards, and the quality of the housing unit itself influence housing satisfaction (Morris and Winter, P. 161).

Harris found that the higher the housing quality, the higher was the overall housing satisfaction. (Harris, P.7).

Meeuwig studied the kinds of activities that fulfill the self-perceived needs of the elderly and the relationship between housing and these activities. The implications of this study were:

> . . . that housing satisfaction and overall preference occurs when a range of housing choices is available, when income is maintained at a level to permit choice, when family activity patterns can be maintained, and when housing selection is made in terms of self-perceived needs and preferences (Meeuwig, P.597).

In this study, a direct connection was made between needs and satisfactions.

Brophy stated that, "satisfaction may be regarded as the state one experiences when one's needs are gratified, or one's aims are accomplished. It is a sense of well-being and one's subjective experience." Housing satisfaction is

the result of subjective evaluation of the degree to which housing needs are met (Brophy, P.268).

In studying satisfaction of new homeowners in Indiana, Brink and Johnston clarified a definition of housing satisfaction with the following:

> "Housing satisfaction is a subjective response to housing need gratification, which the consumer gauges by the degree of fulfillment of his housing expectations and aspirations and by housing improvement achieved over his previous dwelling. Housing satisfaction is continually experienced as the home is constantly evaluated against the consumer's changing needs" (Brink and Johnston, P.344).

In testing this definition, Brink and Johnston found that generally the higher the aspirations are, the less likely they can be completely achieved. This was expected and found to be true. The higher the aspirations are, the lower is the satisfaction. The correlation between the percentage of expected features achieved and satisfaction experienced was positive at a high level of significance. Cost of the house had a significant positive correlation with housing satisfaction. No significant decline in housing satisfaction over time was found (Brink and Johnson, P.342-344).

Housing satisfaction of low income families was studied by Luker, according to Crawford. This study also related satisfaction with the home to the activities

performed in the home and the community. It was found that variables such as tenure, value of the house, number of years married, and the number of years in the community were important in determining a family's housing satisfaction. Owners were found to be generally more satisfied than renters (Crawford, P.17).

Residential satisfaction related to mobility in Rea's study. Many families moved not from dissatisfaction with their present dwelling, but because they could achieve greater satisfaction in a new residence. Some factors attributing to satisfaction as Rea determined were: neighborhood quality, including neighbors of high and rising socioeconomic status; quality schools; and appropriate urban services and facilities. Housing quality in terms of construction and size was not found to be a very important factor.

"Nice people," social status, physical characteristics of the neighborhood, open space, and noncongestion undoubtedly are forces which pull the population toward outlying locations. The motivation to move from rental to ownership status is an important factor which helps to explain residential satisfaction (Rea, P.3-4).

In comparing rural elderly with urban elderly, Hynson found that rural elderly were more satisfied with their

community and expressed greater general happiness. They had fewer fears than urban elderly (Hynson, P.66).

In studying the housing conditions and satisfactions of rural elderly in Florida, Crawford found that 88 percent of the respondents were extremely satisfied with their type of dwelling. One hundred eighty-seven respondents of 282 ranked housing type at the highest level of satisfaction. Homeowners were either extremely satisfied or extremely dissatisfied with their housing, whereas renters were neutral. Fifty-six percent of the owners lived in good housing; only 26 percent of the renters lived in good housing. Housing condition had a bearing on their satisfaction levels. The white respondents were highly satisfied, whereas, the black respondents were highly dissatisfied. Respondents living in good housing were highly satisfied; those living in poorer housing were more unsatisfied. White respondents were predominantly in good housing, whereas black respondents resided in poor housing, which could account for their lower dissatisfaction level (Crawford, P.61,63-64). Dissatisfaction arose from lack of storage space, both outdoors and indoors (Crawford, P. 62). Satisfaction and housing conditions of older rural households also were studied by Moore in Virginia. Satisfactions were found to be significantly related to: arrangement of rooms, size of home, number of rooms,

arrangement for preparing food, amount of storage inside, inside appearance of the house, structural quality (soundness), outside appearance, outside storage, amount expended for other housing costs (rent, mortgage payments, repairs), water supply, sewage disposal method, location related to work, location related to shopping areas, distance to medical services, and availability of fire protection (Moore, P. 35).

Greater security was one of the most satisfactory aspects of apartment living in Simpson's study of the elderly. Respondents were also satisfied with the decrease in housework, the absence of maintenance responsibilities, and the presence of other people (Simpson, P. 48).

Recchie also found that safety and independence contributed to the satisfaction of female residents in an Ohio study (Recchie, P. 72).

In Carp's second study of Victoria Plaza, a housing unit for the elderly in Austin, Texas, safety ranked high among their housing concerns. The unit was located in an unsafe neighborhood. The area lacked eating places, churches and stores. Public transportation was easily accessible, however (Carp, P. 122).

This was not the case in Norman, Oklahoma. Elderly residents were not satisfied with their location for a

subsidized housing development, since the area lacked stores, churches, and doctors, and public transportation was not available (Henderson, P. 200).

Having several children in the family can lead to dissatisfaction in housing, as Rogers and Nikkel found in their research. A critical situation occurs during the child-rearing phase of the family life cycle when external constraints to residential mobility become overwhelming. At this point families are unable to exercise free option in their housing selection, and thus become dissatisfied with their present physical dwelling situation. As the family unit decreases in number due to the departure of children, the dissatisfaction decreases and physical housing characteristics become more suited to the family's needs. It also is possible that families with more children are generally less satisfied due to increased interpersonal interactions and financial stress, and this dissatisfaction is generalized to include housing (Rogers and Nikkel, P. 85-86).

Following a review of past research, Phebus ranked the following factors that often led to dissatisfaction with housing:

(1.) space within the dwelling,

(2.) the social composition of the neighborhood and the physical characteristics,

(3.) cost of housing, and

(4.) poor design or layout of dwelling (Phebus, P. 17).

A number of variables, as pointed out in the research, led to housing satisfaction or dissatisfaction. They include: housing tenure, type, size, quality, value, costs, interior and exterior appearance; family size and needs; years married; years in residence; and available services in neighborhood.

Desired Features in Dwelling

Amenities. Aside from overall satisfaction with the home and its surroundings, there are certain features that individuals desire in a home. Knowing the right ones to include or omit is difficult for builders. The National Association of Homebuilders during a one-year period, from July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976, interviewed new homeowners to help their builders gain insight into the amenities desired. The features they preferred were arrangement of floor plans, exterior style, and larger size rooms. Dissatisfied purchasers reported insufficient storage, too few bathrooms and small lot size. Quality was not their complaint (NAHB, 1976, P.1).

The "Professional Builders' 1976 National Consumer Survey on Housing" was conducted to determine specific consumer attitudes, opinions and preferences of individuals planning to make a home purchase. Their preferences

included having an average of 3.27 bedrooms and 1.78 bathrooms. Heat pumps and solar energy were listed as "excellent" ideas. Fire/smoke detection devices and automatic security systems were rated as "good" ideas (Professional Builder and Apartment Business, P. 141, 148).

The inclusion of such amenities as dishwashers, garbage disposers, air conditioners, balconies or patios, pools, clubhouses, and tennis courts are, in general, appealing to apartment residents. However, such amenities are most important and related to satisfaction among males, younger residents, and those with higher incomes; while females, older persons, and those with lower incomes do not feel these amenities are important (Jarosz, P. 69).

Other families need to sacrifice certain expensive amenities to be able to purchase. In Bayler's study of new home buyers, the amenities frequently sacrificed were enclosed garage, two-car garage, separate family room, central air conditioning, major appliances, carport, fireplace, outdoor living areas, and extra bedroom. The enclosed garage was the amenity sacrificed most willingly. First-time buyers sacrificed certain amenities much more frequently than repeat buyers did (Bayler, P.117)

Sound Insulation. In the research reported by Steidl of 115 residents in two-bedroom apartments in upstate New York, the respondents cited that child care was more

difficult in these apartments than in others because sound insulation within and between apartments was inadequate. The obtrusiveness of the noise that could not be controlled was irritating; therefore, they rated their satisfaction lower for their apartments (Steidl, P.308).

Cranz and Dyer interviewed 190 elderly people and discovered that noise from their neighbors was disturbing, and they were equally concerned about noises they created that would disturb neighbors (Cranz, and Dyer, P.150).

In Vars' study, forty percent of the respondents were dissatisfied with the houses' protection against excessive noise (Vars, P.166).

In their research, Morris and Winter used a variable called "bedroom deficit." The term is based on cultural norms for the number of bedrooms needed to provide adequate space and privacy. The formula used was:

1. The parental couple (or single parent);
2. Each child aged 18 or over;
3. Each pair of same sex children, at least one between the age of 9 and 19, whose ages differ by 4 years or less;
4. Each pair of children of any sex, both under age 9, whose ages do not differ by more than 4 years;
5. Each additional adult or couple (Morris and Winter, P.98)

Space. Space for family activities has been a desirable feature in most homes. Vars concluded from her

study that space plays a critical role in individual perceptions of satisfaction with housing and that the requirements vary with the family life cycle. The homemakers over 40 years of age, those with smaller families, those without children, or those with children over 18 years of age were more highly satisfied (Vars, P.166).

The size of the dwelling space in relation to family activities was studied by Taylor in Colorado. She found that performance of leisure activities was diminished or excluded in limited dwelling space. Families generally have space to perform essential task-oriented activities, but the space may be inadequate for performance of equally essential leisure and recreational activities. When slightly larger dwelling space was available, the number of activities performed, particularly for food preparation associated with entertaining and recreational activities, was increased (Taylor, P.93-94).

One of the more in-depth studies on space versus activities versus satisfaction of family members was the one begun by the United States Department of Agriculture through the Clothing and Housing Research Division of the Agricultural Experiment Stations in 1946. The last stage of the research began in 1954 in the Northeast Region of the United States. Findings of this phase indicated that

stress could be associated with certain areas of the dwelling space according to the stage of the family life cycle. Families with younger children had space problems in the laundry and bathroom areas. School-age children in the family required space for a family or recreation room and an additional area for the husband to pursue at-home interests. Families with older children expressed a desire for space to accommodate diverse but simultaneously occurring activities, and larger bedrooms.

The desired features of the families in the transitional stage or the empty nest stage were convenience and efficiency for meal preparation when entertaining, along with larger dining and living space. They no longer had the same problems as before when the children were living in the home (Smith, P.429).

Steidl reported that in the research done in New York State, child care was more difficult when a shortage of space existed in the kitchen and the bathroom (Steidl, P.308).

As these studies point out, space requirements change with each family. During periods of the life cycle when a shortage of space exists certain activities such as entertaining large groups are eliminated. The family may need an extra room for a bedroom instead of a dining room.

Severe housing shortages existed in the Netherlands

following World War II. When Grootenboer studied the psychiatric problems of children living in homes with insufficient space per individual he found a relationship between lack of space and individual and family disorders. The behavioral health of the children was affected by lack of privacy, unexpressed competition between parents and grandparents living together for love of the child, and inconsistent child care from the two generations (Grootenboer, P.471).

As Mitchell studied the effects of density upon patterns of interaction among family members, he found that parents in high-density housing evidently did not discourage their children from leaving the house and living with someone else. This solution temporarily relieved the high densities; but it tended to reduce the parents' knowledge and control over their children (Mitchell, P.26).

Taylor, in reviewing literature, interpreted the effects of the amount of space per inhabitant per room according to Chombart de Lauwe, a French sociologist. They were:

(1) in too small dwellings, the tension between mother and children becomes critical,

(2) too small dwellings increase the behavioral problems of the child, and

(3) degree of satisfaction varies significantly with the area per person (Taylor, P.22)

Scheflen noted that one means of handling lack of space

in a study of the Central Bronx ghetto was for one or more members of the family to stay out all night (Scheflen, P.441).

According to figures released by the Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the median size home built during 1981 was 1,595 square feet, or 50 square feet less than the median size home built in 1979. Average square footage declined from 1,760 square feet in 1979 to 1,740 square feet in 1980. Apartments increased from 893 square feet in 1979 to 916 square feet in 1980. They had more amenities included, whereas new single-family homes had fewer. This is a reverse of the trend in earlier years toward larger more luxurious homes (NAHB, 1982, P.20).

A 1980 study of preferences conducted by the National Association of Home Builders determined that families still prefer four bedrooms (46 percent) or three bedrooms (42 percent), a family room with a wet bar and a fireplace, a two-car garage, bay windows, separate master bedroom suite, and a deck or patio slab (NAHB, 1982, P.23).

Apartments. In selecting an apartment, respondents in Jarosz's study considered the importance of the following amenities: size and number of rooms, privacy from other residents and outsiders, space for recreation and relaxation, overall size and cost, and operating and fuel costs. In rating their degree of satisfaction they also

considered neighborhood and traffic control. Location in relation to distances from community services, work and schools was also considered in their apartment selection (Jarosz, P.63,70).

In two studies, residents requested showers and tubs in the bathrooms (Recchie, P.73, Carp, P.109). Other features included individual apartment temperature control, increased insulation, insulated doors, double-or triple-glazed windows, storm or thermal pane windows, safety features, improved maintenance, microwave ovens, double-bowl stainless steel sink with a garbage disposal, further development of outdoor areas, low windows to permit a better view of outdoor area when seated, a full basement, a telephone in the bedroom, carpeting,and space to pursue individual interests (Carp, P.101; Rosow, P.334; Rohles, P.124; Cranz, P.150; Simpson, P.48; Gelwicks, P.24; NAHB, 1982, P.21-23).

Residents in Hauber's study of rural rental apartments were asked to rate the importance of general features. The features receiving the highest ratings were easy care interiors, no outside maintenance and apartment complex safety features.

The improvements most often suggested were showers in the bathroom, and additional convenient storage. These are similar to the results found in other studies by Recchie,

Carp, Simpson and Rohles. The most satisfactory features in housing were heating system and temperature controls, arrangement of rooms, carpeted living room and bedroom floors, personal privacy within the apartment and monthly rent. Unsatisfactory features were cost of utilities, if paid separately, parking spaces, bathtub instead of shower, size and availability of community room, location, laundry facilities, and amount of kitchen storage space that is easy to reach (Hauber, P.81-82, 86).

Storage. Storage has been a feature mentioned in several studies (NAHB, 1982, P.22; Vars, P.164; Simpson, P.47; Rohles, P.124; Carp, P.108; Henderson, P.188, and Steidl, P.308). All stated that the amount and convenience of storage are often a concern. Some of the complaints were shortage of closet space, cabinets and storage space; inability to reach the storage areas; lack of a walk-in pantry; and shelves in upper kitchen cabinets and some shelves in closets that were too high.

Vars also discovered that exterior appearance was important to the elderly. They were less satisfied with their housing situation when the building looked institutional or conventional in form, surface and color (Vars, p.166).

Stereotyped Housing. According to Wagner, Dr. Sandra

Howell, who is a member of the faculty of the School of Architecture and Planning at Massachusettes Institute of Technology, was concerned with builders not considering the various influences of contemporary society on the family's housing, and building of stereotyped units. She stated her concerns at a round table of architects, planners, social scientists and writers in 1978.

> "I am particularly concerned with some of the stereotypes that lead designers and developers to believe that the family does not change over time; that people do not grow and develop; that what is established as a houshold for a family that has very young children is not seen as a household that has to be modifiable by the members of the family as they change and grow. To assume that once a person is 'there,' he or she is always there is to create another stereotype.
>
> "We must not segregate by stage in the life-cycle. I am increasingly distressed, and I am really paraphrasing the late Margaret Mead, with the tendency in this society, perpetuated by developers in the private sector as well as the public sector, to say, 'This is all for the family with five kids; this is all for young couples, or singles; this is all for empty-nesters; this is all for old people.'
>
> "And yet we are allowing, in the public sector and in the private sector, that many units, all on the same site, all clustered, for people over the age of sixty-five. I think this is part of the stereotyping. We allow a false notion of preferences to be used to form the societal goals for which we design..." (Wagner,P.98).

If stereotyped dwelling units are being built to fit stereotyped families, who is paying attention to the real housing needs of real people? Almost nobody, was the reaction of several of the panelists.

Dr. Howell put it strongly:

> "It seems to me that housing is often designed as though preferences were needs. When a family goes into the marketplace to look for a home, they really typically do not have free choice. Yet the way they choose is then taken by a marketing expert and read as a matter of preferences when it is a matter of constraints.
>
> "We don't know the answers as to what families need as they change, what women need as they change; and I use the word 'need' rather than 'preference,' because we have to look at human behavior. I am a psychologist, and I don't think we are looking at behavior in a way which evaluates the match between house and people" (Wagner, P.98).

The "typical American family" is changing its complexion. In the housing business this needs to be accepted.

In his remarks to the annual meeting of the American Association of Housing Educators, Willem van Vliet of The Pennsylvania State University used a quote from Herbert Gans', People and Plans,

> "The wife's interest in the home was as a stage on which she presented herself and expressed herself" (Gans, P.188).

As he explained, this stereotyped character is changing. The perception may have been accurate in 1964 and perhaps still is for some. However by 1977, more than half of all American mothers with children in the 6 to 17 age group were gainfully employed. The proportion of employed mothers with children under six has more than tripled from 1950 to 42 percent in 1979, and now represents the fastest

growing segment of the labor force. (Vliet, P.116)

With changes in family living and the economy, families are considering various alternatives in housing as is quoted later in this chapter. Housing education is important.

Housing Tenure

Ownership. According to the National association of Home Builder's 1976 survey the following factors affected home buyers reasons to purchase:

> "Probably the most critical reason for a revival of single-family housing is the realization that this type of unit seems to be the only commodity which appreciates over time.
>
> "In addition, buying a home is a type of forced savings at a time when saving is difficult.
>
> "Overshadowing everything else is the fact that the desire to own a home is still well ingrained in Americans" (NAHB, April, 1976, P. 2).

Bayler stated the following advantages to ownership: real estate offers tax shelter potential, it produces long-term capital gains largely because land and improvements tend to rise in value over time; it generates high rates of return on equity; and it offers psychological returns as investors generally feel there is security and solidity in ownership of tangible assets such as homes and land. These advantages do not include the benefits of using the real estate which this type of purchasing provides.

In her research she found the greatest reason for

purchasing a home was the desire for home ownership. Tax benefits, investment, desire for a private yard, need for a larger home and job transfer were other reasons stated. Most buyers purchased their particular homes because of their location, size, price, floor plan, and style (Bayler, P. 30, 117-118).

Benson gave three rationalizations for families to be willing to purchase:

1. With two incomes they can afford the down payment.

2. With two incomes the family is pushed into a higher income-tax bracket, and the mortgage is a profitable tax exemption.

3. A home is the very best kind of investment, producing a yearly return of ten, twelve, or even higher percent (Benson, P. 76).

However, as Sternlieb pointed out, some of the disadvantages include the fact that real estate is not highly liquid; it is not easy to invest wisely without expert knowledge; it is not free from managerial concern; it is not free from risk concerning the equity invested, and it does not rapidly convert invested funds into income streams (Sternlieb, P.11).

Bayler also pointed out the non-economic considerations which may rule as motivating factors for purchasing homes. When households purchase their homes for such non-economic reasons as the feeling of independence, freedom, and the

security of residence associated with ownership, then such homeowners relate themselves to the housing product essentially as pure consumers, rather than as investors (Bayler, P. 31).

In the survey of new home buyers conducted by NAHB from July 1, 1975 through June 30, 1976 the following reasons were given for ownership:

> The "desire for ownership" was the most reported reason (39 percent) for purchasing a new home, followed by "job change" (18 percent). Almost half (48 percent) of the respondents reported "a better neighborhood" as a reason for selecting the area in which they purchased. About two-thirds (63 percent) purchased their particular home "principally because of its style" (NAHB, 1976, P.2).

Housing Alternatives. During the survey conducted by the Professional Builders' 1976 National Consumer Survey on Housing, respondents indicated that home ownership "creates a savings nest egg and builds equity, gives a feeling of security and roots in the community, and provides privacy."

When asked what type of home they would seek to purchase, 94 percent of the consumers desired a "detached single-family home," while five percent would seek an "attached single-family home," and one percent would choose a "condominium in a low-rise building" (Professional Builder, 1977, P.134).

A sample of 2,801 residents in homes in Washington State revealed that given a choice 76 percent prefer single-

family home ownership. Owning a mobile home and lot was the second choice, with 27 percent. Renting a single-family home was selected by 20 percent. Eighteen percent selected owning a townhouse as their choice. It was shown that individual's housing choices were influenced by certain cultural norms: ownership, detached dwellings, private outside space and the conventional materials from which dwellings are constructed. Single-family dwellings satisfy all these norms. Respondents selected second choices satisfying as many of these norms as possible (Dillman, Tremblay, Dillman, P.5-9).

Joseph Wysocki quoted these same facts from the Housing and Urban Development newsletter the HUD Challenge:

> "In the future, we need to assist people in obtaining their preferred housing. Single-family homes will need to be smaller, more energy efficient and on smaller lots. Next we will have to convince people that they can be happy in a more economical single-family house. Finally, we need to encourage the development of the other three alternatives (mobile homes, renting single homes, and townhouses)" (Wysocki, February, 1981, P.2).

Mobile Homes. Mobile homes are playing a big part in housing American families. However, as Dillman, Tremblay and Dillman pointed out, mobile homes were considered an unconventional dwelling because mobile homes are built in factories, and then transported to a site location. The materials and their recognizable rectangular shape exhibit

an unconventional quality. The unconventional nature of mobile homes is reinforced in many ways, including less desirable available locations, and a limited range of financing terms. Mobile homes do not appreciate at the same rate as single-family homes. They are considered a second-rate financial investment (Dillman, Tremblay, Dillman, P.6).

Owning their own mobile home and lot was the second highest choice of the 2,801 respondents by 27 percent in Washington State in the study conducted by Dillman, Tremblay and Dillman (Dillman, Tremblay and Dillman, P.7). Figures of mobile home sales over the past thirty years reflect the change in attitude toward mobile homes as an alternative single-family dwelling. In 1951 manufacturers sold 67,300 units, and in 1981 they sold 240,313. This last figure, however, is down from the high of 575,940 sold in 1972. The high interest rates of the economic market are affecting all home sales (Manufactured Housing Institute, P.10).

Louisiana figures showed an increase from 6,943 units sold in 1968 to 10,335 in 1977 (Louisiana Manufactured Housing Association, P.4).

Mobile homes are losing some of the stigma associated with them in the past. Sixty percent of the families who selected mobile home living secured sites in rural areas. The majority, 79 percent, were owner occupied, while 21

percent were rented. The reverse was true with the site. Only 27 percent bought their site, as opposed to 73 percent who rented. Of those families living in mobile homes, 22 percent made less than $5,000 per year; 49 percent made $5,000-$14,999; 21 percent made $15,000-$24,999, and only 9 percent were making $25,000 or more (Manufactured Housing Institute, P.9).

In 1975 Bird predicted that mobile homes would continue to play a large role in providing housing for rural households because they were about the only type of new housing that was available to families for less than $15,000 (Bird, P.12). The truth of the prediction was reflected by the statistics of the families living in mobile homes in 1980, with the majority living in rural areas.

Prices of mobile homes have continued to remain considerably lower than site-built homes. Within a six-year period the cost of site-built homes rose considerably per square foot, making mobile homes an attractive alternative, particularly for lower income families. Only the norm of conventionality is sacrificed.

In 1976 the average sales price of a mobile home was $12,750 or $13.09 per square foot, compared to $48,000 for a site-built home or $22.70 per square foot. By 1981 the average sales price of mobile homes was $19,900 or $19.13 per square foot compared to $83,000 for a site-built home

rose $7,150 or $6.04 during the six-year period compared to $35,000 or $16.36 per square foot increase for site-built homes (Manufactured Housing Institute, P.3-4).

Rentership. Hauber, in reviewing a number of studies (Morris, Shanas, Lawton, and Angell) pointed out that as incomes decrease, and utility, maintenance, and repair costs increase, it becomes increasingly difficult to meet occupancy expenses of single-family dwellings or other owned dwellings. This is particularly true of the elderly in their older homes. What may have met the needs of the couple at an earlier stage of the family life cycle may become too large for one or two people. As physical abilities decline, indoor and outdoor cleaning chores may be very difficult. Excessively large, poorly maintained homes, inadequately heated and lacking basic plumbing facilities, may further burden restricted incomes, financial reserves, and health of the elderly owners (Hauber, P. 11-12).

Elderly people may voluntarily or involuntarily be required to move into apartments or congregate housing. In many instances, subsidized housing is necessary.

There is a growing number of elderly people that do not need nursing homes and are not rich, but are over--qualified for subsidized housing. William Smolkin addressed the situation and felt the builder who figures out how to provide affordable housing that keeps pace with the changing

needs of older Americans will be the housing hero of the 1980's. He based his opinions on these facts:

> "During the 1970's, the population aged 55 to 64 increased by 14 percent, and the 65 and older group increased by 26 percent. During the 1980's, the 55 to 64 group is expected to show a minor decrease, while the 65 and older population will grow by 20 percent (Smolkin, P.36).

Another problem facing older families before retirement, age 45 to 55, is the income tax laws. Home buyers take advantage of the law's encouragement to move to increasingly expensive homes. These homes are usually larger than their previous homes. They usually require more energy to heat. They are presently encouraged to be inflationary in shopping for housing and to buy a larger, more expensive home which results in higher energy requirements and larger mortgages (Baskin, P.36).

Apartments may be an alternate form of housing for older people as well as for younger families, those on the move with job transfers, or those unable to afford a down payment or the cost of ownership. Singles and young marrieds may be in need of an apartment as an alternative type of housing choice. The increased divorce rate, too, contributes to the growth in apartment rentals.

Mueller pointed out that until recently apartment renting was looked down upon. This opinion was maintained by many because homeowning was thought to be more prestigious. Renters were thought to be more prone to

violence and to have social values different than those of owners of single-family homes (Mueller, P. 3).

Many have questioned which aspects of a child's well-being and development are most susceptible to effects of apartment living. Vliet reviewed many studies on the topic and found a world-wide concern relating to children's physical and mental health, as well as their social, emotional, and cognitive development. Following a careful review, he stated that, the majority of the studies dealing with hypotheses like those above are characterized by a lamentable lack of scientific rigor in the operationalization of concepts, the selection of respondents, the gathering of data, and the control of external variables in the analysis.

He did find, however, that parents tend to take an "all-or-nothing" approach with respect to children's outdoor behavior. They either relinquish care and let their children play outside anywhere they wish, or they take the over-protective route of keeping them inside the apartment all the time. Children's age seems to be a crucial factor. Younger children living in 20-story blocks played more frequently indoors as compared to children of the same age group living in 4-story walk-ups. Among older children the situation was the reverse. They spent more time outdoors.

He also found that children who had moved to high-rise

apartments had more, rather than fewer friends as compared to children who had moved to houses. This difference did diminish one year after the move, however (Vliet, P.118).

Renting is no longer termed undesirable, since more people now select apartment living. More apartments will be needed in the future.

People in the research studies reviewed above strongly supported ownership of mobile homes or townhouses as housing alternatives. Even those in the rental situation were in favor of the single-family dwelling.

Many apartment residents fantasize a more ideal living situation rather than adapting the present situation to meet their needs. With the expense of single-family homes so great many apartment residents will remain in their present situations for several years.

Rupe found that even the apartment residents that were long-term renters viewed their situations as temporary and postponed their desired lifestyle. This creates an imminent need for a positive approach for educators, manufacturers and retailers to point out the advantages of smaller dwellings and to create illusions of space with furniture smaller in scale, and multifunctional (Rupe, P. 74-75).

However, there are families that are very satisfied with apartment rentals. Crow found in interviewing residents in

apartments in North Carolina, that the majority were satisfied overall with their current lifestyles. They selected apartment living for mobility, affordability, amenities, and family compositon (Crow, P.68).

Rogers and Nikkel, in their study conducted in Boston, did not substantiate the fact that home ownership is a significant variable in housing satisfaction. They felt that it might have been due to the sample families' active acceptance of realistic residential status. Expectations for home ownership in that area of Boston may not be as strong as they appear to be in suburban markets due to lower family income level. When one's neighbors are tenants, there may be no stigma attached to rental status (Rogers and Nikkel, P.85-86).

One-person households have been on the rise, increasing the demand for rental housing. Fisher and Graham cited a quotation by economist Louis Winnick in the 1950's. This trend was noticed then and its projection for the future has been realized. Winnick said, "The one-person household may possibly be the most volatile sector of housing demand, shifting from headship to other household status more readily than other groups" (Fisher and Graham, P. 163).

Many factors have contributed to this shift in society and culture as quoted in Time magazine. Young people are marrying later, and in the meantime they desire a place of

their own. The responsibilities of home ownership are too great for their lifestyles. The high divorce rates create an additional need for apartments, since divided incomes make it impossible for both partners to maintain a single-family dwelling. The elderly have another reason to locate in an apartment--increasing taxes on low, fixed incomes (Time, P.50).

Jarosz, in her research of the rental market, reviewed many studies pointing the way toward the increased need for apartment rentals.

Increased mobility has contributed to the increased need for rental housing. About 17 percent of the American population moves annually. Of this group, nearly two-thirds or 11 percent of the total population will move within the same community. These families are trying to satisfy their housing needs and preferences for themselves and their family members by relocating in another residence (Jarosz, P.12).

Meyerson, Terrett an Wheaton projected future mobility patterns by the past, saying that 20 to 25 percent of all families will have moved at least once in one year; 30 to 33 percent within two years; 50 to 57 percent within five years; 75 percent within ten years; and that within twenty years no more than ten percent will be living in the dwelling they occupy today (Terrett and Wheaton, P.89).

The trend toward apartment living is augmented by the fact that many young people today do not yearn for the big house and yard of yesterday. Preferences for the conveniences and facilities offered by renting an apartment are responsible for this trend. These people would rather put money into boats, campers, vacation homes, and equipment for leisure-time activities than in homeownership (Jarosz, P.12).

Since land is not a replenishable commodity it must be used wisely. Sussna pointed out that the cost of urban land within the last twenty years has gone up 400 percent. Multi-family units, such as apartments, can better utilize smaller parcels of land than can detached single-family units (Sussna, P.6).

Factors Influencing Tenure. Fredland in 1974 outlined factors which influenced housing tenure: length of time a family expects to remain at the next address, the costs of moving for each type of housing tenure, family tastes and desires, income and assets, race, and the offerings of the rental and sales sectors of the total market (Fredland, P.20).

In view of this survey of research, the need for varied forms of housing exists to meet the demands of varied lifestyles. Pickvance (1973) and Meyerson, et al. (1962) looked at this aspect when they described what

is called the life cycle of the "normal" housing consumer. This description starts when the consumer at age 20 or 22 years moves into his first apartment and continues through the whole life-cycle describing the probable housing changes experienced. They stated that in a lifetime the typical consumer occupies six apartments, one rented house, and two or three owned houses, for a total of ten dwellings. This total might increase or decrease in specific cases, given differing variables such as a job change, a war, a depression, a divorce, or an early death. However, Pickvance (1973) quickly pointed out that of the 50 or more years of adult life only twenty are spent as a "husband-wife-child" family, yet this is the only family for which the housing industry provides a significant supply of new dwellings, and it is the type family receiving major attention in most surveys of consumer preferences (Pickvance, P.282-283; Meyerson, et al. P.93-94).

It may be time that research samples not be limited to specific target groups such as the elderly or average family. Housing needs of the general population need to be studied to include the varied problems posed by all segments of society in all types of housing situations. Most of the research reviewed was targeted to some specific audience, thereby eliminating some segments of the society.

Quality of Family Housing

Since many individuals see their housing as an extension of themselves, it directly affects their social relationships.

Quality Features. George Fulton of Walker and Lee, the huge West Coast real estate firm expressed still another concern of contemporary society in relation to their housing--that of quality. He reported that his buyers were spending 26 per cent of their gross income on house payments.

> "While their space requirements are less, these buyers want quality... This quality appearance will be achieved primarily with design innovations providing the greatest illusions of space. Vaulted ceilings, skylights, clerestories, lofts and greenhouse windows have proven popular in our surveys as well as in the market" (Wagner, 1979, P.13).

Linda Simmons, architect and developer, has also been concerned about the illusion of space in the smaller homes she designs. She stated,

> "We need to use all the design tricks we can to increase the illusion of space--large windows, low windowsills, light colors. There are corners and alcoves that can be successfully furnished separately. In other words, the more you get away from or can vary the rectangular room by putting corners and odd little spaces to use, the more you are providing the ability to carry on different sorts of functions. Such an alcove can hold either a giant stereo set or it can have a daybed or it can have a screen around it, and if it has a window, it can become another room. These

> corners add little to the total amount of square footage. We don't get these spaces because, unfortunately, architects tend to like to draw straight lines. Corners and alcoves are a relatively inexpensive way of meeting all these needs, and I think that builders who have incorporated them would testify that it increases marketability" (Wagner, P.99).

Devereaux and Stockman both addressed the question of smaller homes, as they noted buyer's expectations are still big. Buyers want function, looks, comfort and status. There just isn't enough floor space, or separate rooms for cooking, eating and gathering.

Fewer, more versatile rooms can accommodate these functions in less space and often with more excitement. Open floor plans, spatial variety and expansive views will make these multipurpose rooms feel and look bigger than they are (Devereaux and Stockman, P. 60).

Personal Characteristics Related to Quality. In studies focusing on the quality and/or condition of the housing situation, Wilner, et al. determined that some improvements were noted in social relations, self-esteem, and the duration and severity of childhood illnesses, when the quality of housing was improved. These changes enabled improvements in school attendance and scholastic achievement (Wilner, P.214-252).

Many variables seemed to be directly related to quality of housing.

Duncan and Duncan (1955) found that managers lived in better maintained and more expensive homes than did white-collar clerical workers, who in turn live in better housing than blue-collar workers. The housing was similar, but the clerical workers were better housed by spending a greater portion of their salary on housing. Blue-collar workers spent a great amount of money on such items as automobiles and televisions (Duncan and Duncan, P.499).

Education is the aspect that relates more closely with the quality of housing, according to Michelson. Social class is usually related to education and education seems to have an influence on perception of housing adequacy as it influences tastes (Michelson, P.114-115).

Is it no surprise that the quality of housing is a variable affected by degree of exposure to education? Some people strive harder than do others to seek higher standards of housing.

The finding that education affects the quality of housing becomes more understandable in light of other findings which show that education is the aspect of social class which relates most closely to the quality of housing in which man lives (Tilly, P.328).

Households of black people tended to have lower quality housing than those of whites. Hanna and Lindamood, who tested three models in their study, conclude that

differences in housing conditions of black and white households were based on differences in resources, family composition, and past and present discrimination. Their results also provided indirect evidence that blacks share the housing norms of the United States society. Housing preferences of whites and blacks were similar (Hanna and Lindamood, P.39,47).

In selecting a home, home buyers of more modest income are often financially unable to alter the structure beyond a minimal amount and are more concerned with the characteristics of the structure than of the neighborhood. The reverse was true in a study conducted by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. More affluent home buyers were frequently more concerned about neighborhood than with structure to suit their taste (Lynn, P.16).

Improvements. During the first three quarters of 1981, Americans were spending at an annual rate of $47.4 billion on the upkeep and improvement of residential properties according to the Census Bureau. About $30.3 billion of this amount was devoted to additions, alterations and major replacements, while $17.1 billion went for maintenance and repairs (NAHB, 1982, P.24).

Remodeling has been on the increase not only to improve the quality of the dwelling, but also in lieu of moving. According to a 1980 Newsweek survey of remodeling activity

among 8,000 homeowners:

> One-third of those reporting they had completed a remodeling project worth $500 or more said they had substituted remodeling for the purchase of a new home.
>
> Sixty-five percent of the projects were completed entirely or partially by the owner.
>
> Sixty-one percent of those who completed a project owned a house 20 years old or more.
>
> Kitchen modernization was the most popular remodeling project reported by 22 percent at a median cost of $1,611; followed by roofing by 20 percent at a cost of $1,179; and bathroom remodeling by 18 percent at a cost of $1,136.
>
> Forty-seven percent of those reporting that they had completed a major remodeling project said they installed insulation; 20 percent installed double-pane windows and 19 percent installed storm doors (Newsweek, P.47).

Winter found that people who were planning to make home improvements were younger families with one or more dependent children, living in an older home, with an income of $15,000 or more. Education and occupation were not related to making home improvements (Winter, P.1).

Meeks and Firebaugh suggest that the family will not maintain its housing beyond the upper standard limit, because at that point satisfaction from additions to the housing environment declines relatively and other items are preferred over increases in housing quality (Meeks and Firebaugh, P.114).

These studies show that housing satisfaction plays an integral part in desired features and quality in the home.

Economic Factors

Cost of Purchasing a House. The present economic situation in the United States has played an underlying part in affecting housing needs of the individual. The largest single purchase a family usually makes is the family home, and the single biggest hurdle for a family in making that purchase is raising the cash for a down payment. As Ellis Haller, U.S. News and World Report Editor, stated in 1979, "In many instances they will need 20 percent of the price of the house. This is becoming particularly difficult with the cost of all other goods and services rising, also, due to inflation" (Haller, P.105).

Vondal S. Gravlee, President of the National Association of Home Builders, quoted the housing situation in 1978 as follows:

> "In 1973 the median price of a typical new home was about $32,500, while today (1978) the cost is approaching $60,000. In some high-priced urban areas the cost is closer to $80,000. The price of an existing house in 1973 was around $29,000, but today (1978) it's closer to $52,000" (Benson, P.76).

Robert Rice, Associate Dean of the School of Home Economics at the University of Arizona, in speaking to the 1977 annual session of the American Association of Housing Educators, stated, "The median sales price for new housing has jumped 100 percent in less than 10 years, and the median price is predicted to jump to $90,000 by 1986. That

is about double the median price today (1977)" (Rice, P.4).

Figures from the National Association of Realtors supported this trend when they reported, in the twelve months from June, 1978 through May, 1979, the median price of new single-family housing jumped 13 percent, to $62,900. The Association expected roughly the same rise in 1979-1980. They reported that the price of older houses was moving up just as rapidly (Time, P.66).

Paul Killinger, Executive Vice-President of the Home Builders Association of Greater New Orleans, in 1981 stated, "The median price of a new home on the East Bank of New Orleans was $90,000 and on the West Bank $60,000." Therefore, in some urban areas the 1986 projection was reached in half the time (Killinger).

By August, 1981, Housing and Urban Development reported that the national median price of a new home had risen to $72,000 (Wysocki, October, 1981, P.2).

Dale P. Riordan of the Federal National Mortgage Association at the 1982 Agricultural Outlook Conference in Washington quoted figures for August,

> "The median sales price of new single-family houses jumped $3,900 in August to $73,900. Compared with the 1981 level, August's median price was 17 percent higher" (Riordan, P.1).

New home costs declined to a median of $67,700 by September, 1982, then rose 2.5 percent in October to a median of $69,400. November brought a seven percent rise in

the median price to $74,200. This represented a four percent increase over 1981. In spite of the decline in early 1982, by the end of the year prices were back above the 1981 level.

Existing homes were selling at a median price of $68,100 by August, 1982, with a slight drop by October to $66,900. The November increase in median prices also brought the price of existing homes back to a figure of $68,200 ("Specs," December, 1982, P.88; January, 1983, P.216; February, 1983, P.96).

According to a report in 50 Plus, the median price home buyer in 1977 committed himself to a $44,000 purchase. His monthly expenses ran to $400 with $273 toward interest and principal on the mortgage, $60 for utilities, $54 for property taxes, and $13 for insurance. These figures were made public by the United States League of Savings Associations, a trade organization in Washington,D. C. which represents savings and loan associations nationwide (50 Plus, April, 1979, P.17).

In 1981, Herman J. Smith, President of National Association of Home Builders, at the annual meeting of the American Association of Housing Educators explained that monthly payments on a $60,000 mortgage at the 1981 rate of 18 percent came to $904 for principal and interest. That was almost double the payment of $483 at the nine percent

mortgage rate available in 1978. At the 1981 rate it was impossible for more than 90 percent of first-time home buyers to qualify for a modestly priced home (Smith, Herman, P.6).

The opportunity for home ownership was slipping. Erick Calonius asked Economist Michael Sumichrast of the National Association of Home Builders on October 19, 1982 "Was home ownership tougher in 1890 than it is today?" His reply included these observations;

> "Home ownership 100 years ago was expensive and risky for some. Yet, the dream existed. But, for the majority of Americans in 1890, and through successive decades into the 1930's, renting was the only choice.
>
> "In 1890, and until the 1930's, perhaps 18 percent to 20 percent of all families could afford a median-priced new home.
>
> "In 1970, 43 percent of all families could afford such a home. By 1977, that figure had slipped to 27 percent, and by 1982 it had dropped to about 12 percent" (Calonius, P.1,22).

Interest Rates. The continued rise in new home prices was attributable to two factors. Because of high rates, increasing numbers of builders were offering "buy-down" plans to qualify buyers for a mortgage. While this was a price concession in and of itself, it was not reflected in the published figures. Thus, house prices were being kept arbitrarily high in return for discounted mortgage rates during the initial years of mortgage

financing. Another factor that caused housing prices to be higher was that with the high interest rate levels, fewer medium-priced homes were being sold than high-priced homes. Purchasers of the high-priced homes were less affected by high rates (Riordan, P.1).

According to "Dodge/Sweet's Construction Outlook 1980: First Update," failure to reverse the course of inflation during the previous six months had led to a chain of reactions which changed the outlook for the construction market. Chaotic credit conditions eroded 1980's none-too-strong housing potential by more than a quarter of a million units.

Rejection of credit controls by the administration's top policy-makers left only fiscal restraint to back up continued tight money in the administration's renewed anti-inflation effort. However, its impact was felt on the 1981 budget as the attempt was made to cut federal spending by some $15 billion.

The Federal Reserve's boost of its discount rate in February 1980 required lowering the already bleak expectations for housing in 1980. But with so much of 1980's outcome depending on decision-making at the Federal Reserve Board, forecasting was reduced to "creeping up" on the housing outlook by making a downward adjustment with each new pronouncement by the chairman (Christie, P.61).

A setback for housing was the inevitable by-product of the Federal Reserve's toughest move to check inflation through monetary restraint. When the flow of passbook savings decreased in mid-1979 Savings and Loans became increasingly dependent on alternate sources of funds--Money Market Certificates and sales of existing mortgages via the secondary market--to sustain their liquidity. These expedients, worked well during the 1978 period of tight money and continued to provide a base of support to housing finance in 1980.

As short-term rates were pushed still higher, funds that Savings and Loans acquired through Money Market Certificates (for which they paid a high rate of interest competitive with Treasury Bills) could not be loaned out profitably as mortgages. Sharply rising short-term interest rates inhibited secondary mortgage market operations when they encouraged institutional lenders to divert funds into high-yielding short-term securities instead of purchasing existing mortgages in the secondary market. With less support from the non-traditional sources Savings and Loans were exposed to a liquidity squeeze.

In addition to indirectly restricting the availability of mortgage funds, the continued upward movement of interest rates--accelerated by the Federal Reserve Board's round of tightening--choked off homebuilding in the many states

which had 12 per cent usury ceilings on mortgage lending.

For a short time, thrift institutions continued to support a 1.6 million unit rate of housing starts as they honored their existing commitments for mortgage loans. Once these commitments were depleted the 1980 rate of building had to adjust to a reduced volume of lending until the Federal Reserve eased its restraint (Christie, P.67).

New mortgage lending had either stopped or was priced so high that only those home buyers who did not need to borrow money could afford it in 1979.

For years the standard mortgage payments were fixed. But rising interest rates and the changes in the savings markets left the nations mortgage lenders holding the bag with 30-year mortgages paying less than nine percent. In such a market, long term lending becomes very dangerous for the lender.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Comptroller of the Currency decided that lenders could no longer afford the price of "borrowing short and lending long." Lenders were given the advantage of writing mortgage loans with interest rates that rose and fell with an index that reflects the cost of funds to the lender, such as, the rate on six month treasury bills. These became known as adjustable rate mortgages (ARM's).

Another safeguard for the industry was the landmark

financial institutions reform legislation signed into law in October, 1982. The legislation allowed thrift institutions to move into other areas such as commercial loans. They could also offer a short term deposit account in competition with money market mutual funds.

The laws also barred the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation from enforcing its due-on-sale clause prior to July 1, 1983. At that time, however, they ended home loan assumptions.

Many housing people have mixed feelings about due-on-sale clauses. Assumable loans make it easier to sell existing homes and, in turn, the opportunity to sell new homes.

The balance effect is that lenders raise interest rates on new loans to compensate for those old low-rate mortgages remaining on the books. This creates a troublesome two-tier market.

Housing will not fully recover until all institutions that finance housing are financially healthy. Everyone involved must be operating under the same rules. For any one segment to profit at the expense of another, the industry and the market will suffer (NAHB, February, 1982, P.25; Riordan, P.1-2; Smith, Herman, P.6; Jacobs, P.23).

On the side of the buyer, interest rates have caused the American dream of home ownership to become a nightmare.

The average mortgage rate for a new home jumped from 9.1 percent in January 1978, to 10.7 percent in June 1979. It rose faster than at any time since 1973 ("Gimme Shelter," P.66).

In the New Orleans area by 1981 the current interest rate was 15 percent for a conventional mortgage. With a larger down payment or a good rapport with a bank, it was possible to get some loans at 14 or 14.5 percent (Killinger).

According to Housing and Urban Development, average interest rates rose to 16.75 percent by July 1981.

Interest ceilings on most federally insured single-family home loans were raised for the fourth time in five months in October of 1981. The new rate, 17.75 percent, was one percent above the old level. This rate covered fixed rate, level-payment loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans Administration (Wysocki, October, 1981, P.1)

By January, 1982 Herman J. Smith, President of the NAHB in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Housing and Community Development warned,

> "...unless the Congress and the Administration did something soon to bring down interest rates, the shortage of affordable housing would become a major 'ballot box issue' in the 1982 and 1984 elections.
>
> "At 17.5 percent interest," Smith said, the payment on a modest $60,000 mortgage loan is $880

> per month, almost double the payment of two years ago. It requires an annual income of almost $40,000. Virtually no first-time buyers qualify for a home at those interest rates" (Wysocki, February, 1982, P.2).

The Federal National Mortgage Association's expected interest rate forecast by 1982 called for a continued decline in short rates through the year, but a very slow decline in long rates. It seemed unlikely that mortgage rates would fall below 15 percent by the end of 1982.

Mortgage rates continued to recede in October, 1982 but not as much as in September. At 15.62 percent, the average commitment rate on conventional home mortgage loans was the lowest average commitment rate since May 1981.

Mortgage rates fell in November, 1982 for the fourth straight month, dropping to 14.61 percent. It was the lowest average commitment rate since November, 1980.

December brought the fifth consecutive decrease to 14.21 percent. Just one year earlier the rate was 17.47 percent (Riordan, P.1; "Secs," Builder, December/82, P.88; January/83, P.26; February/83, P.96).

In the Wall Street Journal on November 15, 1982 a reduction in the ceiling rate on government-backed home mortgages (FHA-VA) was made to 12 percent. This new rate was the lowest since February 27, 1980. Effective the same day was a reduced rate on multifamily dwellings to 13 percent and 14 percent on interim financing for home construction

and certain land development loans ("FHA and VA Ceiling," P.24).

William Smolkin, a consultant in New Orleans, quoted the FHA-VA home mortgage rate at 12.5 percent in December 1982. He predicted that the market could plan for a ten percent home mortgage rate in 1983 and for an even lower short-term rate (Smolkin, P.25).

Michael Sumichrast, National Association of Home Builders Chief Economist, predicted that interest rates would continue to decline, so that by mid-year 1983 the prime rate would be in the range of 8.5 to nine percent, and it would remain at that level through the end of the year.

He predicted that the FHA-VA rate would drop to about 10.5 percent, and the conventional mortgage rate would fall between 11.5 and 12.5 percent (Sumichrast, P.4).

At Dodge/Sweet's Construction Outlook Conference in October, 1982 George Christie, Chief economist of McGraw-Hill Information Systems, also predicted conventional mortgage rates as low as 12 percent by midyear 1983 (Christie, P.28).

Interest rates were continually rising during the initial writing of this document, however, by the first months of 1983 a steady decline continued. A stabilized market conducive to lending is necessary for a recovery of the housing market.

Even with rates declining, financing at 12 percent is still difficult for most families. According to the Mortgage Bankers Association of America, record numbers of homeowners are failing to meet their monthly mortage payments as unemployment continues to climb. Payments were more than a month late on about one of every 19 residential mortgage loans during the third quarter of 1981. That was a delinquency rate of 5.3 percent nationwide, the highest rate since the group began keeping statistics in 1953 (Wysocki, January, 1982, P.1).

Persistent inflation and record high interest rates increased dramatically the cost of construction and financing of housing. As a result, the rate of new housing starts were slowed and many families were priced out of the housing market. Many other families deferred their first-time purchase of housing. This deferred demand, coupled with that generated by newly formed "baby boom" households, suggests that the eighties will be a period of unprecedented housing demand.

To meet this demand, the supply of housing as well as housing finance will need to be increased. In a period of broad deregulation of the nation's depository institutions, mortgage lenders have argued that this increase in supply of housing and housing finance can be met only by providing even greater flexibility in the design of the mortgage

instrument (Edwards, P.1).

According to the National Association of Realtors, "creative financing" accounts for 60 percent of all existing home sales. Creative financing techniques have gained popularity, both in the new and resale markets, during recent periods of high mortgage interest rates (NAHB, February, 1982, P.28).

The new mortgage designs will increase the choices available to families and individuals and provide more opportunity to fit housing finance decisions more closely to specific needs and circumstances, but they also will require that greater risk and cost be assumed. Would-be home buyers will need to collect and evaluate greater amounts of complex information and to deal with more uncertainty than ever.

To decide on the most appropriate mortgage loan for their circumstances, borrowers will need to evaluate how different mortgage features will interact with their anticipated incomes; their earning, expenditure, and mobility patterns; and the appreciation potential of the homes they wish to purchase. They will require extensive information on mortgage characteristics and factors that influence the nature of the payment stream and total costs over the life of the loan.

Furthermore, because the new regulations provide for a great deal of flexibility in the designing of new

instruments and because the instruments are potentially complicated to administer, individual lending institutions will likely develop and offer only a few specific instruments. Hence, financing policies and techniques will be likely to vary not only from state to state, but also from institution to institution as well. Knowledgeable shopping will be essential for wise decision making.

Professionals who work with individuals and families will need to understand the new instruments, provide thorough and accurate information, and encourage consumers to seek and use this information (Edwards, P.15).

Raising a Down Payment. The single biggest hurdle for a family is raising the cash for a down payment. Personal income has increased during the same period, but the escalation of home prices doubled that of the increase in salaries. This means that no matter how well a family saves its money toward a down payment on a home, the necessary amount increases faster than the money can be saved. Earning five percent on a savings account doesn't mean much when home prices increase ten or twelve percent each year.

Through such programs as VA, FHA and mortgage insurance, some families have been able to buy with a ten to fifteen percent down payment. In a few instances five percent loans were available, but, this was the exception.

As Bayler found in her research, the major measure most

frequently implemented by the households to enable them to purchase a home was the employment of both spouses. Postponement of children may have allowed both spouses to work. Repeat buyers frequently reported the sale of their previous home and savings as a means of down payment. First time buyers usually established a savings plan specifically for a home. They usually bought older homes and made more sacrifices to be able to purchase (Bayler, P.117).

One builder that succeeded in this down-turned market had been taking existing homes in trade on a new home if the existing home had not sold by the time of the closing (Anderson, P.43).

Housing Starts. The market is a real challenge for builders. Unemployment in the construction trades during 1981 was almost 17 percent, more than double the overall rate, 21 (Smith,P.6).

In June housing starts were down, with an average annual rate of 938,000 for the final half of 1982. The increase in housing starts by October 1982 should have helped the unemployment rate. Starts rose only slightly in October to an annual rate of 1.12 million. This figure is up 31 percent from 1981.

By November, 1982, starts jumped 26 percent to an annual rate of 1.4 million units. That was the highest level since December 1980, and was 66 percent higher than 1981.

This trend did not last, however. In December, 1982, starts were back down 13 percent to 1.2 million. For 1982 the total starts were 1.06 million, down two percent from 1.08 million in 1981, and the lowest since 1946.

National Association of Home Builders is predicting that housing starts will climb to 1.36 million units in 1983, up 30 percent. At Dodge/Sweet's Construction Outlook Conference, Christie predicted 1.35 million starts for 1983.

Sales of Homes. Last year, 1982,was the worst year for new homes sales since the Census Bureau began collecting those statistics in 1963. Actual sales in the first half of 1982 were 23.7 percent below sales for the same period the previous year (1981).

New home sales for September 1982 were the highest in 15 months, due to the lower interest rates. Sales jumped 24 percent over August to an annual rate of 464,000. That was 39 percent better than a year earlier.

November 1982 brought another healthy increase of 12 percent to an annual rate of 569,000 units. This was nearly 47 percent higher than 1981 and the highest since August 1980 ("Specs," Builder, December, 1982, P.88; January, 1983, P.216; February, 1983, P.96; Wysocki, July-August, 1982, P.1).

Sales of existing single-family homes in March, 1982 increased by 2.1 percent to a seasonally adjusted annual

rate of 1.99 million units. Dr. Jack Carlson, Chief Economist and Executive Vice-president of the National Association of Realtors, stated that 420,000 existing homes actually changed hands, a decrease of 25 percent from the same period the year before. When housing starts began increasing in the fall of 1982, there was no reported change in the sale of existing homes (Carlson, P.1).

Land Costs. The increasing prices in the housing market have not been due to inflation in the construction industry and the economic situation alone. The escalating price of land has affected the market also.

According to Benson, a task force on housing costs appointed by Housing and Urban Development Secretary Patricia Harris reached a similiar conclusion in 1979. The task force concluded that since the early 1970's the problems of rising housing costs have been greatly increased by two factors--growing environmental and land-use regulation and fiscal difficulties of many American communities. Communities have slowed their growth and new housing development has been restricted. These factors that have quickened the pace of rising housing costs portend a long-term problem for the future unless major steps are taken (Benson, P.78).

When discussing land costs, one has to look at two factors which are significant: the cost of the raw land and

cost of servicing that land with roads, sewer and water lines, utilities and other public facilities.

Once asked about the investment possibilities, Mark Twain years ago replied, "Buy land; they aren't making it anymore." He was right on target. Land prices over the years have increased faster than any other cost component in housing. Today the cost of a developed lot accounts for 20 to 30 percent of the sales price of a typical new home. In 1960 the cost of the lot accounted for only about 15 percent of the price.

Land values are determined by supply-and-demand factors and government land-use policies. Where there is an ample supply of land, prices are held down.

This is not the case, unfortunately, in most large urban areas where the supply of land is extremely tight. With the high demand for housing, land prices naturally increase. A lot of 5,000 square feet with improvements and utilities can sell for $40,000 or more.

In many cases the skyrocketing cost of land can be traced to local zoning laws or some other mechanism, such as a sewer moratorium. The local government creates an artificial shortage of land, which automatically inflates the value of the remaining parcels of land available for development.

Many communities restrict lot size and house size which

insures keeping out lower-income buyers.

The cost of developing land also runs into the thousands of dollars per home. In some areas the builders are charged $3,000 or more per home to hook into sewer and water systems, a cost that is passed on to the buyer of the home. Subdivision roads as wide as interstate highways must be built by developers in some areas, which adds hundreds of dollars to the cost of each house.

According to Benson, a survey by the U.S. Comptroller General found that specifications or standards for streets and related site improvements could increase the cost of a house by as much as $2,655 (Benson, P.78).

Effects of Governmental Regulation

Harry A. Pryde was elected the fortieth president of National Association of Home Builders in 1983. As he shared his thoughts about the new directions he saw for builders and the government's role in the process he stated,

> "For the past 40 years, the government's role in the housing market has been focused in two specific areas. First, the government helped shape a financial system and credit policy that gave home buyers access to credit at affordable rates. The government created specialized mortgage lending institutions. It insured and guaranteed home loans against default. It allowed homeowners to deduct their mortgage interest and property taxes. All these policies, as well as many others, helped bring homeownership within the reach of a greater percentage of the population. It was a tremendous success.

> "In addition, the government provided both direct and indirect assistance to the poor and the elderly who were unable to compete in the free marketplace for housing. Now, for the first time in 40 years, America is without a single housing production program to serve the poor and the elderly. The government's role--though limited--is vital to reestablish housing as a top national priority" (Pryde, P.79).

Through the years the government has become involved in other areas of housing-regulating measures. Government, particularly local, has created a real regulatory monster. The amount of government red tape, hearings and various regulatory bodies with which a builder is required to deal each year is multiplying. Naturally, when there is no coordination among the ten or more regulatory bodies that have some say in the development process, builders are going to run into trouble as well as delay.

Time is money to builders; the longer it takes to plan and build a subdivision, the more it will cost consumers. Instead of planning and completing a subdivision in 15 months, it is common today for a builder to spend two years cutting through red tape and clearances before he can begin construction.

Woodhaven Developers of Riverside, California, were successful in making a profit. One of the procedures used had been to keep construction time to about sixty days. Throughout the development they were able to complete twenty houses per day (Anderson, P.46).

When time means this much to a builder, two years--even two months delay in red--tape is costly. The consumer eventually pays for it.

A colleague of Vondal S. Gravlee, 1979 President of the National Association of Home Builders, summed up the situation this way,

> "Instead of spending 80 percent of the time on the site in the subdivision as ten years ago, by 1979,80 percent of the time was spent in going to meetings, hearings and in the office doing paperwork. There was less control over the quality of the work than ten years before when the builder was on the site doing a lot of the carpentry work himself" (Benson, P.78).

We have become one of the best housed nations in the world, but one of the consequences of that good fortune is that many Americans today have a tendency to pull up the gangplank once they have their own home and resist growth within their communities. The consequences of these actions are things such as exorbitantly high sewer tap fees and minimum restrictions on the square footage of housing, which does not accommodate the needs of today's first-time home buyers. We also find resistance to higher density housing. In some locations we find that innovative concepts such as plastic pipe are not allowed. The list could go on and on, but suffice it to say that a Rutgers University study showed that over-regulation adds 20 percent to the cost of a home on the average. The Carter Administration commissioned a study by Dr. Alfred Kahn's Cost of Living Council, which

reported in 1980 that overregulation added in excess of 20 percent to the price of the average home (Smith, Herman, P.7).

Governmental regulations, particularly zoning requirements and red tape of local governments, can increase the cost of a house 33 percent, according to a study by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (Stuart, p.4).

Reporting on that same study Martin M. Mintz, Director of Technical Services for National Association of Home Builders stated in Builder, the National Association of Home Builders' newspaper,

> "NAHB has long maintained that many state and local government regulations are directly responsible for increasing the cost of housing.
>
> "The standards on these regulations are said to be higher than those needed for adequate engineering purposes.
>
> "It is generally agreed also that the lengthy processing times for approving applications greatly increases the cost of housing" (NAHB, April, 1981, P.3).

Housing and Urban Development demonstrations were conducted by private builders in 1980 to study the savings possible by reducing regulations. Most of the savings came from a reduction in processing time, the use of creative site and building design and contemporary engineering standards, and minor deviations from existing codes and ordinances.

Similar reductions in costs can be achieved in most

communities where local governments have up-to-date codes and ordinances and where rapid processing can be provided (NAHB, April, 1981, P.3).

Another study reported in Time, September 12, 1977 backed these figures stating, "Restrictive zoning practices and other government regulations imposed on builders account for $9,844 of a $50,000 home, or 20 percent" (Time, P.54).

Without a stimulus program from the Reagan administration and in the face of a continuing tight monetary policy and upcoming record federal deficits, a significant turnaround in the current housing depression is not foreseen in 1982 (Wysocki, July, August, 1982, P.1).

Harry Pryde 1983 President of the National Association of Home Builders, stated that he had three specific policy and legislative objectives for 1983:

(1) The Federal Reserve Board must continue its present, more accommodating monetary policy. Federal Reserve Board policy is the key to lower interest rates. Rates didn't fall sharply until the Federal Reserve Board abandoned its experiment in monetarism in October last year. The Fed must give the economy room to expand. Any return to the policies of the past would send interest rates soaring again and choke off the recovery.

(2) The deficit problem must be solved.

(3) Housing must be given access to credit as this nation molds a new financial system, allow pension funds to invest in residential mortgages, provide mortgage tax credits for all investors in residential mortgages, expand and strengthen existing primary and

> secondary mortgage market programs, preserve existing tax benefits for homeownership and rental housing, extend the authority of state and local governments to offer tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds, and creating individual housing accounts to encourage young people to save for a down payment on a home (Pryde, P.80).

The present administration is taking a look at housing. On regulatory reform, the White House is moving ahead to implement the recommendations proposed by the President's Housing Commission.

The recently issued report of the President's Commission on Housing offered these proposals for the nation's housing: end construction of low-income housing, use vouchers instead, for the poor to obtain housing; create a "housing component" in the Community Development Block Grant program to allow communities to deal with local housing problems; remove regulatory and tax impediments to condominium conversion; broaden sources of mortgage funds, including use of pension funds; and end a number of federal, state and local regulations (Wysocki, July, 1982, P.1).

The White House is looking for ways to encourage local communities to repeal outdated zoning and building regulations, to increase densities, to reduce fees and dedication requirements and to streamline the entire regulatory process. This effort is particularly important because of the demand for starter homes. The only way to meet that demand is by building smaller units in higher

density developments, and that is not possible in many communities because of obsolete zoning and subdivision requirements.

The National Association of Home Builders and other leading homebuilding associations were disappointed with the report and feel it was less than what is needed to turn around a plummeting economy. Their main objection was that the plan does not address the home builders' biggest problem, higher interest rates.

Demand for Housing

Despite the increase in home prices and the rising interest rates for mortgages, there is still a record demand for houses and they are selling fast in most areas.

The demographic foundation of the demand for shelter is now approaching its all-time peak. The present rate of household formation at 1.7-1.8 million per year is 10 percent stronger than it was in 1976, and will continue at this rate through the early 1980's (christie, P. 67).

The millions of people born just after World War II are beginning careers, starting families and looking for housing. During the decade of the 1980's about 42 million Americans will reach the age of 30, the prime home-buying age. During the 1970's, only 30 million Americans reached 30.

This large group of first-time home buyers will be among the first to face the consequences of the most severe and prolonged housing slowdown within modern memory. Demographers have pegged the need for new homes at more than two million units annually throughout the 1980's. But, already from 1980-1982 the supply of new homes has been under two million each year. A deficit is building.

Statistics from the 1980 Census bring to light past predictions. The changing social patterns in the nation's population have implications for the housing needs in the nation.

Although the number of family households increased 15.7 percent between 1970 and 1980, nonfamily households--that is, persons living alone or with non-relatives--rose 71.9 percent in the ten-year period. As a result, nonfamily households comprised 26.7 percent (21.5 million) of total households, compared with 19.7 percent in 1970. Most of those, 85 percent, were persons living alone. Such growth reflects an increased number of separations and divorces, postponement of marriage by many young adults and a greater number of older persons living alone after becoming widowed.

Another important statistic is that among the 30.3 million American families with children under 18 years old in 1980, 5.8 million, 19.1 percent, were single-parent

families. This number is up from 12.3 percent in 1970 (Cheshire,P.22).

Another big market going into the 1980's will be the millions of Americans reaching retirement age. Many will sell their present homes and move to smaller housing units, such as condominiums. The recently enacted tax exclusion of up to $100,000 for those 55 and older will stimulate this market (Benson, P.76).

Alfred Gobar, top housing-market researcher, addressed the complexion of the contemporary family during a National Association of Home Builders' convention in 1979. He stated,

> "There should be a very large number of people forming separate households. Household size is decreasing very rapidly because people are getting married later and keeping smaller families and getting divorced earlier. Thus we should absorb relatively more housing per thousand population because we have more households per thousand population" (Wagner, March, 1979, P.13).

George Fulton of Walker and Lee, the huge West Coast real-estate firm, made this statement at the convention, "While the percentage of our buyers who are married has remained constant at 85 percent, in 1975-92 percent had children in the home, but in 1978 only 65 percent had children" (Wagner, March, 1979, P.13).

These figures support the demand for additional housing for the next five to ten years. As quoted earlier the supply of housing is dwindling, unemployment in housing is high and sales and starts are lower than previous years.

Thus we realize we are in the midst of a housing depression or a low production, high unemployment period.

Housing as an Investment

The near doubling of the cost of new one-family homes over the past half-dozen years has been, paradoxically, more of an incentive to buy new or existing homes than it has been a deterrent.

Housing is to the typical American family what gold is to many Europeans--a good hedge against inflation.

The majority of people buying new homes today are "moving up the ladder," using the inflated profit on their previous homes to move into more expensive new homes. This fact is one of the prime reasons that more expensive homes have been in greater demand in recent years. It also is one of the main reasons that the median price of homes has gone up nationally, and that price increases have been absolutely staggering! As Vondal Gravlee, President of National Association of Home Builders, stated in testimony during 1979 before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, there has been a 70 percent hike in the price of a single-family home in a five-year period (Benson, P.76).

This, price rise has made housing the best investment a person can make in inflationary times. Many people are looking at it that way, and extending their resources to buy a home. When individuals can get a mortgage on that basis,

they are spending 25 percent or more of their income for mortgage payments.

Extension Education

Professional home economists are concerned with "the attainment of the well-being of individuals and families, the improvement of homes, and the preservation of values significant in home life." That the physical environment of the home is significant for the well-being of individuals and families is commonly recognized (Brown, P.3).

Extension home economists play a vital role in housing education in communities across the nation. As professional home economists, they are employed by the Cooperative Extension Service, a nonformal, out-of-school educational organization supported by the United States Department of Agriculture, state land grant universities and colleges, and county governments. An Extension Home Economist has a degree in home economics or related field, a keen interest in people, and a sincere interest in helping others help themselves (National Association of Extension Home Economist, P.1).

The Cooperative Extension Service had its origins in the agricultural societies as far back as 1785. By 1914, through the efforts of Congressman A. Frank Lever and Senator Hoke Smith, the Smith-Lever Act became law and the Cooperative Extension Service was established on a permanent

national basis (Sanders, P.27).

The scope and function of the Extension Service is found in the original statements of the act,

> "to aid in the diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage the application of the same."

As Loomis and chairman reported in their study,

> "The first educational responsibility of the Service is to carry to rural people the teaching and results of research of the state agricultural colleges and experiment stations and the United States Department of Agriculture. The purpose is that of helping to apply the teachings and research findings to improve the farm, the home, the community, and the nation. The Cooperative Extension Service does not operate alone on the knowledge and research of the colleges and the USDA. Long ago it learned that the people, through their own experience and study of their own problems, have much to contribute to the improvement of rural life.
>
> "This three-way partnership between local people, the state, and the federal government can only exist when the local people elect to participate. This partnership structure has educational implications. Extension agents with the help of local leaders assemble facts about the situation in the county and together develop educational programs based on the needs of the people" (Loomis and chairman, P.52-53).

This chain of command was initiated in Section Four of the Smith-Lever act as amended:

> "Before the funds herein provided shall become available to any college for any fiscal year, plans for the work to be carried on under this act shall be submitted by the proper officials of each college and approved by the secretary of agriculture" (Sanders, P.29).

"To help provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family," as first stated in the 1949 Housing Act and reaffirmed in the 1968 Housing Act, is the goal of the housing education program. To write a plan of work to disseminate educational information that will be used to reach this goal, it is necessary to determine the needs of the families.

The gap that exists between the present situation or status and a new or changed set of conditions assumed to be more desirable, is defined as a "need" according to Leagans. It is the difference between "what is" (the present home) and what "could be" (the desired home). People have to recognize the gap between the actual and the desirable, and place value on attaining the desirable before change can take place (Leagans, P.93).

Extension programs are offered on a voluntary basis and, according to Leagans, for them to be successful they must focus on and help meet recognized personal, family, group or community needs. The program should accurately identify what people want, think they need, and actually do need, and get these woven into a realistic, well-organized, and concrete series of forceful activities (Leagans, P.90).

As literature was reviewed in housing education programs it was found that even though housing is an area that seems particularly crucial to the quality of life of

individuals as well as communities, it is questionable whether the approach often taken at the high school level really attacks the issues and gives the students knowledge that will help with housing problems of the low-income. A high school housing unit usually is highly, oriented toward design and decorating. It is questionable whether or not low-income students can relate their housing needs to this middle class approach. Students are not likely to view wallpaper, paint and curtains as a solution when their family is paying high rent for a two room shack that leaks, and has no heat or running water. Although "bedroom decor" may be more fun to teach than "programs in our community for plumbing", the latter may be more related to quality of life issues for low income students (Slagh and Lindamood, P.23).

The same principle applies in teaching many middle and low-income homemakers. The needs of the clientele must be met. As Maslow stated a lower need must be met before a higher need surfaces (Maslow P.80).

Reardon's study was conducted to determine why some individuals seek help to improve their housing while others choose to move. She found that those who wanted help tend to be younger and may have limited resources. Households of black people and those who have a young child or several dependent children tended to be more likely to want help. Also, when there were particular restrictive situations,

such as an unemployed head of the household or poor quality housing, the household was more likely to want help.

Those who were likely to want to make changes in their housing were generally younger and may live in a lower quality housing unit. They may have lived there for a relatively short period of time and may rent their housing unit. However, the spouse of the head may be employed which would give the household a higher income.

Of those who wanted to make changes in their housing, younger households and black households were more likely to want help. Young families, those who have several children and those with a higher educational level preferred moving to making home improvements. However, owner-occupants and female heads of households preferred making home improvements to moving. Younger households, those who lived in higher quality housing and those with a higher income were more likely to have a desire for classes (Reardon, P.58-59).

During the Extension Committee on Policies Housing Workshop in St. Louis in 1976, Dr. Ray Vlasin of Michigan State University explained that in Extension agents we get involved with the "product"--the individual housing unit, its furnishings and equipment. Extension agents need to be involved with the "process" of housing--getting everyone housed, hopefully in a decent home that they can afford, and

in housing that satisfies their physiological, psychological, and social needs. To be involved in the "process" would mean to be involved in the housing of a group. It is an area in which we can make a greater impact and contribution to the community, individuals and families (White, P.309).

This is the reference Slagh and Lindamood were making--teaching the "process" more than the "product". As Slagh and Lindamood organized their research the underlying assumption was that knowledge of student interests, their present housing conditions, levels of housing satisfaction, and housing knowledge should aid in planning positive learning experiences about housing (Slagh and Lindamood, P.26).

A similar procedure was used in this study to determine the present housing conditions of the respondents, their level of housing satisfaction, their present level of knowledge of housing concepts, their expressed needs for additional housing information, and the methods of teaching most practical for them. Through this information, it is hoped that a program of work based on the needs of the people will be formulated and executed to enable families to provide a decent home and a suitable living environment for themselves.

CHAPTER III

Research Methodology

Information for this study was obtained by conducting 100 interviews using a prepared interview schedule.

Population

The population for this study was composed of the 390,461 households in the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area including the parishes of Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines and Saint Bernard.

Sample

To select the sample of 100 respondents random sampling was used. It was decided to divide the geographic area into zip codes. The total number of households in each zip code was tabulated from Criss-Cross Directories. The number of respondents to be interviewed in each zip code was determined proportionately according to the number of households in each zip code to equal 100 respondents.

Each of the names of the streets and the household numbers was listed in Criss-Cross Directories. A number was selected at random to determine which street or which household number of the selected street to begin counting to make the selection. A second number was selected at random to count the street names or household numbers to identify

the street and the household selected (Criss-Cross Directories, p. 10-20, 24-349).

In the event the household was vacant or the respondent was unable to be reached by the third attempt the next household on the list was selected. All households were listed, including those without telephones. The households selected at random all had telephones, however.

Data Collection

Data for this study were collected by telephoning the selected respondent and conducting the interview over the telephone with a prepared interview schedule. See the Appendix for a copy of the prepared interview schedule. If the respondents refused to participate in the study because they were "too busy," had "too many demands" on their telephone at that time, or were skeptical of the authenticity of the study, the respondent was asked if the same questionnaire was mailed to them with a self-addressed stamped envelope would they be willing to participate. A choice seemed necessary when a number of the sample respondents refused to participate in the telephone interview, but were willing to respond to a mail questionnaire. Some also felt more secure in receiving information through the mail with a copy of L.S.U. staff identification rather than giving information to an unknown telephone caller. Of the 100 respondents,

31 responded by mail. To get a representative sample it was important to use the combined methods of interviewing to include those respondents that were refusing to participate initially in the survey. Using the telephone interview method alone would have affected the representativeness of the sample to the population. There were nine contacts that did refuse to participate.

Survey Instrument

The interview schedule was designed to obtain data from the residents in four general areas as follows:

1.) The present housing situation relative to:
   a.) Housing tenure
   b.) Average house size and type
   c.) Amount of income spent on housing expenses
   d.) Property value
   e.) Length of residence in present dwelling
2.) The family's feelings as to:
   a.) Condition of dwelling and its maintenance
   b.) Satisfaction with dwelling
   c.) Dwelling meeting family needs and requirements
   d.) The adequacy of their storage
   e.) The adequacy of the dwelling for entertaining
3.) The family's short and long term plans for the dwelling

4.) The family's housing education relative to:

a.) Present knowledge of selected housing concepts

b.) Expressed need for additional information on selected housing concepts

c.) Past housing educational experiences

d.) Preferred methods of receiving additional housing information

Data were also collected on a number of selected variables including: age, occupation, income, educational level, sex, family size and composition.

Each respondent was asked whether or not they were satisfied with their residence. This response was used as the dependent variable to determine whether there was a relationship between their satisfaction and the independent variables tested.

The interview schedule was pretested by interviewing several respondents, then necessary revisions were made before the final copy was developed.

Each schedule was edited, and the data were coded for analysis at the Louisiana State University computer.

The information gathered was then assembled and typed into an Apple II personal computer. The program utilized was Wordstar, a word processor program. It is a very accurate program for compiling both words and tables in mass to produce the final document.

The Apple II Computer has 64K RAM of memory which has

the capacity of 64,000 kilobytes of RAM. (Random Access Memory) Four 5 1/2 inch disk drives were coupled together to hold the information on diskettes which allowed both the storage and collation of the document for final printing.

The printing was accomplished by an in-line Smith Corona daisy wheel printer which read the diskettes and typed 120 words per minute of letter quality finished copy.

Data Analysis

Since the respondents of this study represented a sample of the total population, it is possible that the differences between the respondents in the sample and the population were due to sampling error rather than actual differences. In order to control the possibility of sampling error the chi-square (X^2) test was applied to the data. The chi-square was used to test for significance of differences between selected variables concerning various aspects of the housing situation and overall housing satisfaction. The results were found to be significant at the .05 level of probability.

Frequency distributions were ranked for:

1. The respondents planning to improve their house within one year and those planning improvements within five years.
2. Extent of knowledge of selected housing concepts
3. Extent of help from previous housing education

4. Extent of expressed need for information on housing concepts

5. Practicality of teaching methods

6. Extent of familiarity with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service

The mean was computed for the:

Age of respondent
Total number in household
Total number of children
Total cost of housing
Total cost of house note
Total cost of rent
Total cost of electricity
Total cost of gas
Total cost of water, sewerage and garbage pick-up
Total cost of insurance
Total cost of taxes

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data

The study of 100 residents in the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area was designed to determine factors associated with housing satisfaction.

The sample for this study consisted of 100 households selected at random from Criss-Cross Directories of the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area including parishes of Jefferson, Orleans, Plaquemines and Saint Bernard.

The findings describe characteristics of the residents, the present housing situation of the sample, resident's satisfaction with overall housing situation, resident's long and short term plans for housing, present level of knowledge of selected housing concepts, previous housing education, expressed needs for additional housing information and preferences of methods of receiving that information.

The differences between those "more satisfied" and those "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation for a number of these variables were also examined using chi-square analysis to assess significance. The arithmetic mean was computed for some of the variables, other data were listed according to frequency distributions and percentages were presented where appropriate.

Sex of Respondent

The sex of all 100 respondents was identified. There were 17 males and 83 females participating in the interview (See Table I).

TABLE I

A COMPARISON OF
SEX OF RESPONDENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Sex of Respondent	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Male	17	53	47	100
Female	83	55	45	100

X^2 =.035 with 1 d.f., P<.8514

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 53 percent of the males were "more satisfied" and 47 percent were "less satisfied". Of the females 55 percent were "more satisfied" and 45 percent were "less satisfied".

The difference in extent of overall housing

satisfaction by sex of respondent was not statistically significant at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = .035$ with 1 d.f., $P<.8514$.

Age of Respondent

Each respondent was identified by age. It was found that 35 percent were 35 years of age or less, 32 percent were 36 to 50 years of age and 33 percent were 51 years of age or over. (See Table II)

TABLE II

A COMPARISON OF
AGE OF RESPONDENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Age of Respondent	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
35 or less	35	23	77	100
36 - 50	32	69	31	100
51 & over	33	76	24	100

$X^2 = 22.8$ with 2 d.f., $P<.0001$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 23 percent of those 35 or less were "more satisfied" and 77 percent were "less satisfied," and 69 percent of those 36 to 50 were "more satisfied" and 31 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation while 76 percent of those 51 and over were "more satisfied" and 24 percent were "less satisfied." The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by age of respondent was very significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 22.8$ with 2 d.f., $P < .0001$.

The older respondents were more satisfied with their overall housing situation than the younger respondents were.

In computing the mean score for the age of the respondents it was found that the mean was 45.4. Of those "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation the mean score was 50.7 compared to those "less satisfied" with a mean of 38.9.

Spouse and No Spouse

Each respondent was asked, if they had a spouse. It was found that 74 percent of the respondents had a spouse living in the residence. Twenty-six percent did not have a spouse living in the residence. (See Table III)

TABLE III

A COMPARISON OF
SPOUSE AND NO SPOUSE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Spouse	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	74	55	45	100
No	26	54	46	100

$X^2 = .02$ with 1 d.f., $P < .90$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 55 percent of those with a spouse were "more satisfied" and 45 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-four percent of those without a spouse were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation compared to 46 percent who were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by spouse and no spouse was not significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = .02$ with 1 d.f., $P < .90$.

Educational Level of Respondent

Each respondent was asked to identify their educational level. It was found that 17 percent had under 12 years of school, 36 percent had completed high school, 23 percent had some training beyond high school, 24 percent completed a college degree. (See Table IV).

TABLE IV

A COMPARISON OF
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF RESPONDENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Educational Level of Respondent	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Under 12 yrs.	17	59	41	100
High School	36	53	47	100
Beyond High School	23	43	57	100
College Degree	24	67	33	100

$X^2 = 2.886$ with 3d.f., $P<.50$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 59 percent of those with less than 12 years of school were "more satisfied" and

41 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-three percent of those completing high school were "more satisfied" and 47 percent were "less satisfied," while 43 percent of those with training beyond high school were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 57 percent were "less satisfied." Sixty-seven percent of those with one or more college degrees were "more satisfied" and 33 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by educational level of respondent was not significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 2.886$ with 3 d.f., $P < .50$.

Occupation of Respondent

Each respondent was asked to identify their occupation. It was found that 15 percent were professionals, 28 percent were in white collar positions, eight percent were laborers, and 49 percent were in all other groups including homemakers, unemployed and retired persons. (See Table V)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 73 percent of the professionals were "more satisfied" and 27 percent were "less satisfied;" 32 percent of the white collar group were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 68

TABLE V

A COMPARISON OF
OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Occupation of Respondent	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Professional	15	73	27	100
White Collar	28	32	68	100
Labor	8	63	37	100
Other	49	61	39	100

$X^2 = 8.7$ with 3d.f., $P<.10$

percent were "less satisfied;" 63 percent of the laborers were "more satisfied" and 37 percent were "less satisfied;" and 61 percent of the other group including the homemakers, unemployed and retired persons were "more satisfied" and 39 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by occupation of respondent was not significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 8.7$ with 3 d.f., $P<.10$

Number in Household

Each respondent was asked to identify the number of persons residing in the household. It was found that 41 percent of the households had one to two persons living in the residence, 40 percent had three to four persons, and 19 percent had five or more persons. (See Table VI)

TABLE VI

A COMPARISON OF
NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Number in Household	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
1 - 2	41	71	29	100
3 - 4	40	47	53	100
5 or more	19	37	63	100

$X^2 = 7.540$ with 2d.f., $P < .05$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 71 percent of the households with one to two persons were "more satisfied" and 29 percent were "less satisfied;" 47 percent of the

households with three to four persons were "more satisfied" and 53 percent were "less satisfied," and 37 percent with five or more persons were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 63 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by number in household was significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 7.540$ with 2 d.f., $P<.05$.

The households with one to two persons living in the household were "more satisfied" than those with three or more persons.

Children in Household

Each respondent was asked if they had children living in the residence. It was found that 37 percent of the households were married couples or adults without children, and 63 percent were households with children. (See Table VII)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 76 percent of the households without children were "more satisfied" and 24 percent were "less satisfied," while 43 percent of those with children living in the residence were "more satisfied" and 57 percent were "less satisfied."

TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF
CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Children in Household	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Without children	37	76	24	100
With childern	63	43	57	100

$X^2 = 10.639$ with 1d.f., $P<.01$

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by children living in the household was significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 10.639$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$.

Households with children were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation than households with married couples and adults without children.

Total Number of Children by Age

The respondents with children living in the residence were asked to identify the number of children in each age group. It was found that 35 percent had children five years

of age or under living in the residence, 36 percent had children ages six to twelve, 39 percent had children ages 13 or over. (See Table VIII)

TABLE VIII

A COMPARISON OF
AGE OF CHILDREN
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Ages of Children	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
5 and under	35	20	80	100
6 - 12	36	47	53	100
13 and over	39	56	44	100

$X^2 = 10.693$ With 2d.f., $P < .01$

*Totals do not total 100, since some families had children in more than one category or more than one child in a single category. Thirty-seven respoondents did not have children.

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 20 percent of the the households with children five and under were "more satisfied" and 80 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-seven percent of the children ages six to 12 were living with

those respondents "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation, while 53 percent were with those "less satisfied," and 56 percent of the children ages 13 and over were living in the residence with those "more satisfied" while 44 percent of the children ages 13 and over were living with those "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by the ages of children living in the residence was significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 10.693$ with 2 d.f., $P<.01$.

The respondents with younger children were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Income

Each respondent was asked to identify their annual income category. It was found that 24 percent made under $15,000 per year; 27 percent were in the $15,000 to $30,000 category; 27 percent were in the $30,001 to $40,000 category; and 22 percent were in the over $40,000 category. (See Table IX)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 58 percent who made under $15,000 were "more satisfied" and 42 percent were "less satisfied;" 44 percent who made $15,000 to $30,000 per year were "more satisfied" and 56 percent were "less

TABLE IX

A COMPARISON OF
INCOME
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Income	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Under $15,000	24	58	42	100
$15,000 - $30,000	27	44	56	100
$30,001 - $40,000	27	48	52	100
Over $40,000	22	73	27	100

$X^2 = 4.628$ with 3 d.f., $P<.30$

satisfied;" 48 percent who made $30,001 to $40,000 were "more satisfied" and 52 percent were "less satisfied;" and 73 percent who made over $40,000 per year were "more satisfied" and 27 percent "less satisfied".

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by income was not significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 4.628$ with 3 d.f. $P<.30$.

Even though the chi-square test was not significant, those respondents making over $40,000 per year were

"more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Monthly Housing Cost

Each respondent was asked to identify their total cost of housing for the month. It was found that 31 percent spent under $300 per month; 39 percent spent $300 to $499 per month; and 30 percent spent $500 or over. (See Table X)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 58 percent of those who paid under $300 per month for their total housing costs were "more satisfied" and 42 percent were "less satisfied;" 51 percent who spent $300 to $499 per month were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 49 percent were "less satisfied;" and 57 percent of those who spent $500 or over per month were "more satisfied" and 43 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by monthly housing cost was not significant statistically at the .05 level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 2.006$ with 2 d.f., $P < .50$.

TABLE X

A COMPARISON OF
MONTHLY HOUSING COST
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Monthly Housing Cost	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Under $300	31	58	42	100
$300-$499	39	51	49	100
$500 & over	30	57	43	100

$X^2 = 2.006$ with 2 d.f., $P<.50$

Average Monthly Costs of Housing

The average monthly cost of housing was $419.21 with 57 respondents below average and 43 respondents paying above average monthly housing costs.

For those respondents with a house note the average monthly note was $168.24 for the 54 respondents paying house notes. For those paying rent the average monthly rent payment was $72.77 for the 29 respondents paying rent. This figure seemed low for a monthly rent payment on a house or apartment, but the mean also included the cost of rent for land to park a mobile home.

The average cost of utilites was $53.92, with $103.41 an average for the 95 respondents paying electricity, $32.07 an average for the 72 respondents paying for gas, and $16.28 for water, sewerage and garbage pick-up for 80 respondents. Some of the respondents did not show a monthly cost for utilities, since they paid for them indirectly in their monthly rent payment.

The average monthly cost of insurance on the residence and its furnishings was $22.62 and $3.61 for taxes.

Years in Present Residence

Each respondent was asked how long they had lived in their present place of residence. It was found that 34 percent had lived less than 5 years, 44 percent had lived from 5 to 15 years, and 22 percent lived more than 16 years at their present place. Thus nearly 4 out of five persons had been 15 years or less in their present residence, which suggests a fairly mobile population. (See Table XI)

When these were further divided by extent of satisfaction with their overall housing situation it was found that 32 percent of those who lived in their present place of residence under five years were "more satisfied" and 68 percent were "less satisfied;" 59 percent of those who lived in their present residence from 5 to 15 years were "more satisfied" compared to 41 percent who were "less satisfied." Eighty-two percent who lived in their present residence 16

TABLE XI

A COMPARISON OF
NUMBER OF YEARS IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Number of Years in Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Under 5	34	32	68	100
5 - 15	44	59	41	100
16 or over	22	82	18	100

$X^2 = 13.74$ with 2 d.f., $P < .01$

years or over were "more satisfied" and 18 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by years in residence was significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 13.74$ with 2 d.f., $P < .01$.

The "more satisfied" residents were much more likely to have lived longer in their present place of residence.

Type of Housing

The respondents were asked to identify the type of housing in which they resided. Data collected showed that 72 percent lived in a house, seven percent in an apartment, 12

percent in a duplex and nine percent in a mobile home.

Since most of the respondents, 72 percent, lived in a house, all other categories, 28 percent of the respondents, were combined for further analysis. (See Table XII)

TABLE XII

A COMPARISON OF
TYPE OF HOUSING
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Type of Housing	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
House	72	62	38	100
Other *	28	36	64	100

$X^2 = 5.844$ with 1 d.f., $P < .02$

* - Apartment, Duplex or Mobile Home

When these were further divided by extent of satisfaction with overall housing situation it was found that, sixty-two percent of the respondents who lived in a house were "more satisfied," while 38 percent were "less satisfied. Thirty-six percent of the respondents who lived in other types of housing, such as an apartment, duplex or mobile home were "more satisfied," while 64 percent were "less satisfied."

The literature showed that houses or single-family dwellings are preferred by the American family. Data collected showed that a high majority reside in houses. The data was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 5.844$ with 1 d.f., $P<.02$. The "more satisfied" residents were more likely to reside in a house.

Housing Tenure

Each respondent was asked their housing tenure. It was found that 75 percent owned their place of residence while 25 percent rented. (See Table XIII)

TABLE XIII

A COMPARISON OF
HOUSING TENURE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Housing Tenure	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Own	75	65	35	100
Rent	25	24	76	100

$X^2 = 12.943$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

When the data were further divided by extent of satisfaction with overall housing situation, it was found that 65 percent of the respondents who owned their own place were "more satisfied," while 35 percent were "less satisfied." Twenty-four percent of the respondents who rented were "more satisfied," with their place of residence while 76 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by housing tenure was significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 12.943$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$.

These figures show that a higher percentage of people who own their home are "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation than those who rent.

Value of Residence

Each respondent was asked the approximate value of their place of residence. Data on this question were collected on 92 of the 100 interviewed. Some respondents such as apartment renters were unable to give even an approximate value. These values were divided into three categories as follows: twenty-one percent lived in a residence valued under $40,000; 48 percent lived in a residence valued between $41,000 and $80,000; and 24 percent lived in a residence valued $81,000 and over. (See Table XIV)

When these were further divided according to extent of

overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 29 percent who lived in a residence valued $40,000 and under were "more satisfied" compared to 71 percent who were "less satisfied," while 60 percent of those who lived in a residence valued between $41,000-$80,000 were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 40 percent were "less satisfied." Sixty-seven percent of those respondents living in a place of residence valued over $81,000 were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation, while 33 percent were "less satisfied."

TABLE XIV

A COMPARISON OF
VALUE OF RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Value of Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
$40,000 & under	21	29	71	100
$41,000-$80,000	48	60	40	100
$81,000 & over	24	67	33	100

$X^2 = 7.809$ with 2d.f., $p < .05$

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by value of their place of residence was statistically significant at the .05 percent level of probability as shown by $X^2 = 7.809$ with 2 d.f., $P < .05$.

Those respondents living in more expensive residences were more likely to be "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Number of Regularly Used Bedrooms

Each respondent was asked the number of bedrooms used regularly by the family. Twenty-two percent had one regularly used bedroom, 36 percent had two, and 42 percent had three or more. (See Table XV)

When these figures were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 73 percent of the respondents with one regularly used bedroom were "more satisfied" compared to 27 percent who were "less satisfied." Fifty percent of the respondents who had two regularly used bedrooms were "more satisfied," and 50 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty percent of the respondents with three or more regularly used bedrooms were "more satisfied," and 50 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by number of regularly used bedrooms was signigicant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 14.44$ with 2 d.f., $P < .01$.

TABLE XV

A COMPARISON OF
REGULARLY USED BEDROOMS
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Number of Regularly Used Bedrooms	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
1	22	73	27	100
2	36	50	50	100
3 or more	42	50	50	100

X2= 14.440 with 2 d.f., P<.01

The respondents with only one bedroom were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation than those respondents with more than one. The respondents with two or more regularly used bedrooms were equally divided between "more satisfied" and "less satisfied."

Guest Bedrooms in Residence

The respondents were also asked whether or not they had guest bedrooms in addition to the regularly used ones. It was found that 41 percent did while 59 percent did not have one or more guest bedrooms. (See Table XVI)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 73 percent of those with guest bedrooms in the residence were "more satisfied" and 27 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation, compared to 42 percent of those without guest bedrooms who were "more satisfied" and 58 percent who were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

TABLE XVI

A COMPARISON OF
GUEST BEDROOMS IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Guest Bedrooms	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	41	73	27	100
No	59	42	58	100

$X^2 = 9.270$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by number of extra guest bedrooms in residence was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 9.270$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

Those respondents with guest bedrooms in the residence were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Living Areas in Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had two or more living areas in their place of residence. It was found that 72 percent had one while 28 percent had two or more living areas. (See Table XVII)

TABLE XVII

A COMPARISON OF
NUMBER OF LIVING AREAS
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Number of Living Areas	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
1	72	50	50	100
2 or more	28	68	32	100

$X^2 = 2.597$ with 1 d.f., $P<.20$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 50 percent of those respondents with one living area were "more satisfied" and 50 percent were "less satisfied." Sixty-eight percent of

those respondents with two or more living areas in the residence were "more satisfied" and 32 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by number of living areas was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 2.597$ with 1 d.f., $P<.20$.

Dining Room in Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had a dining room in their place of residence. Seventy-one percent reported having a dining room while 29 percent did not. (See Table XVIII)

TABLE XVIII

A COMPARISON OF
DINING ROOM IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Dining Room in Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	71	55	45	100
No	29	55	45	100

$X^2 = 2.037$ with 1 d.f., $P<.10$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 55 percent of those respondents with a *dining room in residence* were "more satisfied" and 45 percent were "less satisfied," compared to 55 percent of those without a dining room who were "more satisfied" and 45 percent who were "less satisfied."

This difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by dining room in residence was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 2.037$ with 1 d.f., $P<.10$.

Number of Bathrooms in Residence

Each respondent was asked the number of bathrooms in residence. Thirty-nine percent had only one bathroom while 61 percent had two or more. (See Table XIX)

When these were divided further by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 46 percent of those respondents with one bathroom in the residence were "more satisfied" and 54 percent were "less satisfied," while 61 percent of those respondents with two or more bathrooms in the residence were "more satisified" and 39 percent were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by number of bathrooms in residence was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 2.021$ with 1 d.f., $P<.20$.

TABLE XIX

A COMPARISON OF
NUMBER OF BATHROOMS
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Number of Bathrooms	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
1	39	46	54	100
2	61	61	39	100

$X^2 = 2.021$ with 1 d.f., $P<.20$

Laundry Area in Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had a laundry area in their place of residence. Seventy-six percent had a laundry area while 24 percent did not. (See Table XX)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 58 percent of those respondents with a laundry area in the residence were "more satisfied" and 42 percent were "less satisfied," while 46 percent of those respondents without a laundry area in the residence were "more satisfied" and 54 percent were "less satisfied".

TABLE XX

A COMPARISON OF
LAUNDRY AREA IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Laundry Area in Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	76	58	42	100
No	24	46	54	100

$X^2 = 1.072$ with 1 d.f., $P<.3005$

The difference in extent of housing satisfaction by laundry area in residence was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 1.072$ with 1 d.f., $P<.3005$.

Extra Rooms in Residence

Each respondent was asked if there were extra rooms in the residence for sewing, hobbies and other family activities. Twenty-three percent said yes, while 77 percent said no. (See Table XXI)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 65 percent of those respondents who had extra rooms in the residence were "more

TABLE XXI

A COMPARISON OF
EXTRA ROOMS IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Extra Rooms in Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	23	65	35	100
No	77	52	48	100

$X^2 = 1.260$ with 1 d.f., $P < .30$

satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 35 percent were "less satisfied," compared to 52 percent of the respondents without extra rooms in the residence who were "more satisfied" and 48 percent who were "less satisfied."

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by extra rooms in the residence was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 1.260$ with 1 d.f., $P < .30$.

Garage with Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had a garage with

their residence. Forty-one percent said yes, while 59 percent said no. (See Table XXII)

TABLE XXII

A COMPARISON OF
GARAGE WITH RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Garage in Residence	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	41	66	34	100
No	59	47	53	100

$X^2 = 3.308$ with 1 d.f., $P < .10$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 66 percent of those respondents having a garage with the residence were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 34 percent were "less satisfied," while 47 percent of those respondents not having a garage with the residence were "more satisfied" compared to 53 percent of those who were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing

satisfaction by a garage with the residence was not statistically significant as shown by X^2 =3.308 with 1 d.f., P <.10.

Carport with Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had a carport with their residence. It was found that 28 percent of the respondents had a carport in their residence, while 72 percent did not. (See Table XXIII)

TABLE XXIII

A COMPARISON OF
CARPORT WITH RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Carport with Residence	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	28	61	39	100
No	72	53	47	100

X^2 = .513 with 1 d.f., P <.50

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 61 percent of those respondents having a carport with the residence were "more

satisfied" and 39 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation, while 53 percent of those not having a carport with the residence were "more satisfied" and 47 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference by extent of overall housing satisfaction by a carport in the residence was not statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = .513$ with 1 d.f., $P < .50$.

Enclosed Outdoor Storage with Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had enclosed outdoor storage with their place of residence. Fifty-five percent of the respondents had outdoor storage, while 45 percent did not. (See Table XXIV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 58 percent of those respondents who had enclosed outdoor storage with their residence were "more satisfied" and 42 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation. Fifty-one percent of those respondents who did not have enclosed outdoor storage were "more satisfied" and 49 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by having enclosed outdoor storage with the

residence was not significant statistically as shown by X^2 = .500 with 1 d.f., P∠.50.

TABLE XXIV

A COMPARISON OF
ENCLOSED OUTDOOR STORAGE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Enclosed Outdoor Storage	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	55	58	42	100
No	45	51	49	100

X^2 = .500 with 1 d.f., p∠.50

Patio with Residence

Each respondent was asked if they had a patio with their residence. It was found that 57 percent had a patio with their residence, while 43 percent did not have a patio. (See Table XXV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 61 percent of those having a patio with the residence were "more satisfied" and 39 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing

TABLE XXV

A COMPARISON OF
PATIO WITH RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Patio with Residence	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	57	61	39	100
No	43	47	53	100

$X^2 = 2.196$ with 1 d.f., $P < .20$

situation. Forty-seven percent of those not having a patio with the residence were "more satisfied" and 53 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by having a patio with the residence was not statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 2.196$ with 1 d.f., $P < .20$.

Total Number of Rooms in Residence

Each respondent was asked the number of rooms in residence. It was found that twelve percent had less than five rooms in the residence. Forty-nine percent had five to

seven rooms, while 39 percent had eight or more rooms in the residence. (See Table XXVI)

TABLE XXVI

A COMPARISON OF
TOTAL NUMBER OF ROOMS IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Total Number of Rooms in Residence	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Less than 5	12	33	67	100
5 - 7	49	59	41	100
8 or More	39	56	44	100

$X^2 = 2.654$ with 2 d.f., $P < .30$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 33 percent of the respondents with less than five rooms in their residence were "more satisfied" and 67 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-nine percent of those respondents with five to seven rooms in their residence were "more satisfied" and 41 percent were "less satisfied," while 56 percent of the respondents with eight or more rooms in their residence were

"more satisfied" and 44 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by total number of rooms in residence was not significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 2.654$ with 2 d.f., $P < .30$.

Adequacy of Food Storage

Respondents were asked where they stored food items in the home. The majority, 70 percent, stored food items in the kitchen cabinets. Thirty-four percent used a pantry for the only place for food storage or in addition to other storage areas. Four percent were required to use other closets in the home to have enough space for food storage. Seven percent had to use other areas of the home for food storage, such as, the garage or under the stairs.

Respondents were asked if their food storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Forty-seven percent said their food storage was very adequate, 41 percent said fairly adequate and 12 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXVII)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 70 percent of those with very adequate storage of food were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 30 percent were

"less satisfied." Forty-two percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of food were "more satisfied" and 58 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of food storage was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 7.818$ with 1 d.f. $P<.01$.

Those respondents who were very satisfied with their food storage were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

TABLE XXVII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF FOOD STORAGE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	47	70	30	100
No	53	42	58	100

$X^2 = 7.818$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

Adequacy of Storage of Kitchen Equipment

Respondents were asked where they stored kitchen equipment in the home. Ninety-six percent stored kitchen equipment in the kitchen cabinets, while ten percent stored kitchen equipment in various improvised areas in other rooms in the home and added shelves throughout the house.

Respondents were asked if their kitchen equipment was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifty-two percent said their kitchen equiment storage was very adequate, 32 percent said fairly adequate and 16 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXVIII)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 65 percent of those with very adequate storage of kitchen equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 35 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-four percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of kitchen equipment were "more satisfied" and 56 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of kitchen equipment was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 8.129$ with 1 d.f. $P < .01$.

Those respondents with very adequate storage for kitchen equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

TABLE XXVIII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF KITCHEN EQUIPMENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	52	65	35	100
No	48	44	56	100

$X^2 = 8.129$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

Adequacy of Linen Storage

Respondents were asked where they stored linens in the home. Sixty-one percent stored linens in linen closets, while 20 percent stored linens in the bathroom closet and 26 percent stored their linens in improvised storage areas, such as boxes under the beds, large travel bags and cedar chests.

Respondents were asked if their linen storage was very

adequate, fairly adequate or not adequate. Fifty-seven percent said their linen storage was very adequate, 27 percent said fairly adequate and 16 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXIX)

TABLE XXIX

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF LINEN STORAGE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	57	65	35	100
No	43	42	58	100

$X^2 = 8.189$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 65 percent of those with very adequate storage of linens were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 35 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-two percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of linens were "more satisfied" and 58 percent were "less satisfied" with their

overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of linens was statistically significant as shown by X^2 =8.189 with 1 d.f. P<.01.

Respondents with very adequate storage of linens were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Drug and Cosmetic Storage

Respondents were asked where they stored drugs and cosmetics in the home. Eighty-nine percent stored drugs and cosmetics in the bathroom closet, while 17 percent stored them in the bedroom, and 18 percent stored them in other rooms, such as the kitchen, hall, and dining room.

Respondents were asked if their drug and cosmetic storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifty percent said their drug and cosmetic storage was very adequate, 38 percent said fairly adequate and 12 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXX)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 68 percent of those with very adequate storage of drugs and cosmetics were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 32 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-two percent of those

TABLE XXX

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF DRUG AND COSMETIC STORAGE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	50	68	32	100
No	50	42	58	100

$X^2 = 6.828$ with 1 d.f. $P<.01$

respondents who did not have very adequate storage of drugs and cosmetics were "more satisfied" and 58 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of drugs and cosmetics was statistically significant as shown by $X^2=6.828$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$. (See Table XXX)

Those respondents who had very adequate storage for drugs and cosmetics were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Regularly Worn Hanging Clothing

Respondents were asked where they stored regularly worn hanging clothes in the home. Ninety-four percent stored regularly worn hanging clothes in the bedroom closets, while 17 percent stored regularly worn hanging clothes in improvised storage, such as added hanging rods in the laundry area next to the washer and dryer or near the ironing board.

Respondents were asked if their storage for regularly worn hanging clothing was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifty-five percent said their regularly worn hanging clothing storage was very adequate, 27 percent said fairly adequate and 18 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXI)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 73 percent of those with very adequate storage of regularly worn hanging clothing were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 27 percent were "less satisfied." Thirty-three percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of regularly worn hanging clothing were "more satisfied" and 67 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

TABLE XXXI

A COMPARISON OF ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF REGULARLY WORN HANGING CLOTHING TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION, GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	55	73	27	100
No	45	33	67	100

$X^2 = 15.519$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of regularly worn hanging clothing was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 15.519$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

The respondents with very adequate storage of regularly worn hanging clothing were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Folded Clothes

Respondents were asked where they stored folded clothes in the home. Ninety-three percent stored folded clothes in drawers in the bedroom furniture, while 5 percent used

improvised storage, such as the buffet in the dining room.

Respondents were asked if their folded clothes storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Sixty-two percent said their folded clothes storage was very adequate, 28 percent said fairly adequate and ten percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXII)

TABLE XXXII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF FOLDED CLOTHING
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	62	65	35	100
No	38	39	61	100

$X^2 = 5.970$ with 1 d.f., $P<.02$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 65 percent of those with very adequate storage of folded clothing were "more

satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 35 percent were "less satisfied." Thirty-nine percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of folded clothing were "more satisfied" and 61 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of folded clothes was significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 5.970$ with 1 d.f., $P < .02$.

The respondents with adequate storage of folded clothing were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Out-of-Season Clothing

Respondents were asked where they stored out-of-season clothing in the home. Fifty-eight percent did not store out-of-season clothing, while 42 percent stored out-of-season clothing in another closet in the home. Some took more precaution than others. Some merely hung the clothes in another closet, while others used a cedar lined closet or moth balls for protection.

Respondents were asked if the storage for out-of-season clothing was very adequate, fairly adequate or not adequate. Fifty-seven percent said the place they kept out-of-season clothing was very adequate, 20 percent said fairly adequate and 23 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the

last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXIII)

TABLE XXXIII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF OUT-OF-SEASON CLOTHING
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	57	65	35	100
No	43	42	58	100

$X^2 = 5.262$ with 1 d.f., $P<.05$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 65 percent of those with very adequate storage of out-of-season clothing were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 35 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-two percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of out-of-season clothing were "more satisfied" and 58 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of out-of-season

clothing was significant statistically as shown by $X^2=5.262$ with 1 d.f. $P < .05$.

The respondents who were very satisfied with their storage of out-of-season clothing were also "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Outdoor Recreation Equipment

Resondents were asked where they stored outdoor recreation equipment, such as bicycles and bar-be-cue grills in the home. Sixty-one percent stored outdoor recreation equipment in an outdoor storage area, while ten percent stored it inside the home. Twenty-two just left the outdoor recreation equipment out-of-doors in the yard or on the patio, and four percent used other storage areas, such as under the trailer, under the house, or at someone else's house.

Respondents were asked if their outdoor recreation equipment storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Thirty-six percent said their storage of outdoor recreation equipment was very adequate, 32 percent said fairly adequate, and 18 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXIV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 69 percent of those with very adequate storage of outdoor recreation equipment

were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 31 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-six percent of those respondent who did not have very adequate storage of outdoor recreation equipment were "more satisfied" and 64 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of outdoor recreation equipment was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 9.364$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

TABLE XXXIV

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF OUTDOOR RECREATION EQUIPMENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=43	Less Satisfied N=43	Total N=86
Yes	36	69	31	100
No	50	56	64	100

$X^2 = 9.364$ with 1 d.f., $P<.01$

The respondents with very adequate storage of outdoor

recreation equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Indoor Recreation Equipment

Respondents were asked where they stored indoor recreation equipment in the home. Thirty-two percent stored indoor recreation equipment in the living room or den, while five percent stored indoor recreation equipment in the hall closet. Fifty percent stored indoor recreation equipment in the bedroom closet and 18 percent used other rooms in the home, such as the office, the library, the junk room and the toy room.

Respondents were asked if their indoor recreation equipment storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Forty percent said their indoor recreation equipment storage was very adequate, 35 percent said fairly adequate and 17 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 70 percent of those with very adequate storage of indoor recreation equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 30 percent were "less satisfied." Forty percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of indoor

TABLE XXXV

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF INDOOR RECREATION EQUIPMENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=49	Less Satisfied N=43	Total N=92
Yes	40	70	30	100
No	52	40	60	100

$X^2 = 7.966$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

recreation equipment were "more satisfied" and 60 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of indoor recreation equipment was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 7.966$ with 1 d.f. $P < .01$.

The respondents with very adequate storage of indoor recreation equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Recreational Vehicles

Respondents were asked where they stored recreational

vehicles, such as campers and boats in the home. Twenty-six percent stored recreational vehicles in the yard, while 15 percent stored recreational vehicles in the an outdoor storage area.

Respondents were asked if their recreational vehicle storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifteen percent said their recreational vehicle storage was very adequate, eight percent said fairly adequate and twenty percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXVI)

TABLE XXXVI

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF RECREATIONAL VEHICLES
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=26	Less Satisfied N=18	Total N=43
Yes	15	67	33	100
No	28	54	46	100

$X^2 = .688$ with 1 d.f., $P<.50$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 67 percent of those with very adequate storage of recreational vehicles were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 33 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-four percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of recreational vehicles were "more satisfied" and 46 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of recreational vehicles was not statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = .688$ with 1 d.f. $P < .50$.

Adequacy of Storage of Seasonal Items

Respondents were asked where they stored seasonal items in the home. Fifty-four percent stored seasonal items in the attic, while 20 percent stored seasonal items in closets in extra rooms in the residence. Thirteen percent stored seasonal items in an outdoor storage area, while five percent used improvised storage areas, such as in boxes under the bed and in trunks.

Respondents were asked if their seasonal item storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Forty-seven percent said their seasonal item storage was very adequate, 26 percent said fairly adequate and 11 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two

categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXVII)

TABLE XXXVII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF SEASONAL ITEMS
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=49	Less Satisfied N=35	Total N=84
Yes	47	72	28	100
No	37	41	59	100

$X^2 = 8.613$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 72 percent of those with very adequate storage of seasonal items were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 28 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-one percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of seasonal items were "more satisfied" and 59 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing

satisfaction by adequacy of storage of seasonal items was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 8.613$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

Those respondents with very adequate storage of seasonal items were "more satisfied" with their overall housing satisfaction.

Adequacy of Storage of Laundry Supplies

Respondents were asked where they stored laundry supplies in the home. Eighty percent stored laundry supplies in the laundry area, while 15 percent stored laundry supplies in other rooms in the home. Fourteen percent stored laundry supplies in the bathroom.

Respondents were asked if their laundry supply storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifty-four percent said their laundry supply storage was very adequate, 34 percent said fairly adequate and 12 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXVIII)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 72 percent of those with very adequate storage of laundry supplies were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 28 percent were "less satisfied." Thirty-five percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of

laundry supplies were "more satisfied" and 65 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of laundry supplies was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 14.068$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

The residents who were very satisfied with their laundry supply storage were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

TABLE XXXVIII

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF LAUNDRY SUPPLIES
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	54	72	28	100
No	46	35	65	100

$X^2 = 14.068$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

Adequacey of Storage of Cleaning Supplies

Respondents were asked where they stored cleaning

supplies in the home. Seventy-four percent stored cleaning supplies in the kitchen or laundry area, while 29 percent stored cleaning supplies in other rooms in the residence. Six percent stored cleaning supplies in outdoor storage areas.

Respondents were asked if their cleaning supply storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Fifty-one percent said their cleaning supply storage was very adequate, 38 percent said fairly adequate and 11 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XXXIX)

TABLE XXXIX

A COMPARISON OF ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF CLEANING SUPPLIES TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION, GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Yes	51	67	33	100
No	49	43	57	100

$X^2 = 5.724$ with 1 d.f., $P<.02$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 67 percent of those with very adequate storage of cleaning supplies were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 33 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-three percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of cleaning supplies were "more satisfied" and 57 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of cleaning supplies was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 5.724$ with 1 d.f., $P < .02$.

The respondents with very adequate storage for cleaning supplies were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Adequacy of Storage of Yard Care Equipment

Respondents were asked where they stored yard care equipment in the home. Two percent stored yard care equipment in an enclosed outdoor storage area, while 12 percent stored yard care equipment outside, exposed and unprotected.

Respondents were asked if their yard care equipment storage was very adequate, fairly adequate, or not adequate. Forty-six percent said their yard care equipment storage was very adequate, 24 percent said fairly adequate and 19

very adequate, 24 percent said fairly adequate and 19 percent said not adequate. For further analysis the last two categories were combined due to small frequencies. (See Table XL)

TABLE XL

A COMPARISON OF
ADEQUACY OF STORAGE OF YARD CARE EQUIPMENT
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Adequate	N	More Satisfied N=49	Less Satisfied N=40	Total N=89
Yes	46	72	28	100
No	43	37	63	100

$X^2 = 10.709$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction, it was found that 72 percent of those with very adequate storage of yard care equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 28 percent were "less satisfied." Thirty-seven percent of those respondents who did not have very adequate storage of yard care equipment were "more satisfied" and 63 percent

were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by adequacy of storage of yard care equipment was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 10.709$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

The respondents with very adequate storage of yard care equipment were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

Extent Residence Meets Needs

Each respondent was asked the extent to which their residence meets the family's needs for housing. It was found that 50 percent said very well, 39 percent said fairly well, while 11 percent said not well. (See Table XLI)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction with extent residence meets housing needs, it was found that 90 percent of the respondents who felt their residence met their housing needs very well were "more satisfied" and 10 percent were "less satisfied." Twenty-six percent of the respondents who felt their residence met their housing needs fairly well were "more satisfied" and 74 percent were "less satisfied." There were

TABLE XLI

A COMPARISON OF
EXTENT RESIDENCE MEETS NEEDS
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Extent Residence Meets Needs	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Very Well	50	90	10	100
Fairly Well*	39	26	74	100
Not Well*	11	0	100	100

$X^2 = 49.495$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

*Fairly well and not well categories were combined for chi-square test due to small cell frequencies.

none of the respondents who felt that their housing did not meet their needs that fell in the " more satisfied" category while 100 per cent of the respondents who felt that their housing did not meet their needs fell in the "less satisfied" category.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction with extent residence meets housing needs was significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 49.495$ with 1 d.f. $P < .01$. Fairly well and not well categories were combined

for the chi-square test.

Those respondents who were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation lived in a residence that met their housing needs very well, while more of the "less satisfied" lived in residences that met their needs fairly well or not well.

Amount of Entertaining in Home

Each respondent was asked the amount of entertaining they did in their residence. It was found that 16 percent entertained often, 48 percent occassionally, 29 percent seldom and seven percent said they never entertained in their residence. (See Table XLII)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction it was found that 81 percent of the respondents who entertained in their home often were "more satisfied" and 19 percent were "less satisfied." Fifty-six percent of the respondents who entertained in their homes occasionally were "more satisfied" and 44 percent were "less satisfied," while 41 percent of those respondents who entertained in their residences seldom were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 59 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-three percent of the respondents who never entertained in their homes were "more satisfied" and 57 percent were "less satisfied."

TABLE XLII

A COMPARISON OF
AMOUNT OF ENTERTAINING IN RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Amount of Entertaining	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Often	16	81	19	100
Occasionally	48	56	44	100
Seldom*	29	41	59	100
Never*	7	43	57	100

$X^2 = 7.071$ with 2 d.f., $P < .05$

*Due to small cell frequencies the last two catagories of seldom and never were combined to compute chi-square.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by the amount of entertaining in the residence was significant statistically as shown by $X^2 = 7.071$ with 2 d.f., $P < .05$.

Those residents who were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation entertained more often in their residence.

Satisfaction with Residence When Entertaining

Each respondent was asked how well satisfied they were with their residence when entertaining. It was found that 40 percent were very well satisfied; 39 percent were fairly well satisfied, while 21 percent were not satisfied. (See Table XLIII).

TABLE XLIII

A COMPARISON OF
SATISFACTION WITH RESIDENCE WHEN ENTERTAINING
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Satisfaction With Residence When Entertaining	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Very Well	40	85	15	100
Fairly Well*	39	46	54	100
Not Well*	21	14	86	100

$X^2 = 24.242$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

*Due to small cell frequencies the fairly well and not well categories were combined for chi-square test.

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction with residence when entertaining, it was found that 85 percent of those respondents who were very

well satisfied with their residence when entertaining were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and 15 percent were "less satisfied." Forty-six percent of the respondents who were fairly well satisfied with their residence when entertaining were "more satisfied" and 54 percent were "less satisfied." Fourteen percent of the respondents who were not well satisfied with their residence when entertaining were "more satisfied" and 86 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing satisfaction.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by satisfaction with residence when entertaining was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 24.242$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

The residents expressing more satisfaction with their overall housing situation expressed greater satisfaction with their residence when entertaining.

The main reason given for not being satisfied with their residence for entertaining was too crowded. Other reasons included: lack of furniture, residence needs repairs, needs decorating, do not want to disturb neighbors, and neighborhood unsafe.

Rating of Overall Condition of Residence

Each respondent was asked to rate the overall condition of their residence. It was found that 64 percent rated their residence as being in good condition; 28 percent rated

their residence in fair condition, while eight percent said their residence was in poor condition. (See Table XLIV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction with rating of overall condition of residence, it was found that 77 percent of the respondents who rated their residence in good condition were "more satisfied" and 23 percent were "less satisfied." Fourteen percent of the respondents who rated their residence in fair condition were "more satisfied" and 86 percent were "less satisfied," while 25 percent of the respondents who rated their residence in poor condition were "more satisfied" and 75 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing satisfaction by rating of overall condition of residence was statistically significant as shown by $X^2 = 33.396$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$.

Those respondents who were "more satisfied" with their overall housing satisfaction rated their residence in good condition, while those "less satisfied" rated their residence in fair or poor condition.

TABLE XLIV

A COMPARISON OF
RATING OF OVERALL CONDITION OF RESIDENCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

		Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction		
Condition	N	More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Good	64	77	23	100
Fair*	28	14	86	100
Poor*	8	25	75	100

$X^2 = 33.396$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

*Due to small cell frequencies the fair and poor catagories were combined to compute chi-square.

Rating of Home Maintenance

Each respondent was asked to rate how well their residence was maintained. It was found that 51 percent of the respondents said very well, 39 percent said fairly well, while ten percent said not well. (See Table XLV)

When these were further divided by extent of overall housing satisfaction with rating of home maintenance, it was found that 80 percent of those respondents who rated the maintenance of their home as very well were "more satisfied"

TABLE XLV

A COMPARISON OF
RATING OF HOME MAINTENANCE
TO OVERALL HOUSING SATISFACTION,
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Rating of Home Maintenance	N	Percent By Extent of Overall Housing Satisfaction: More Satisfied N=55	Less Satisfied N=45	Total N=100
Very Well	51	80	20	100
Fairly Well*	39	31	69	100
Not Well*	10	20	80	100

$X^2 = 27.114$ with 1 d.f., $P < .01$

*Due to small cell frequencies the fairly well and not well categories were combined for computing chi-square.

with their overall housing satisfaction and 20 percent were "less satisfied." Thirty-one percent of the respondents who rated the maintenance of their home fairly well were "more satisfied" 69 percent were "less satisfied," while 20 percent of the respondents who rated the maintenance of their residence as not well were "more satisfied" and 80 percent were "less satisfied" with their overall housing situation.

The difference in extent of overall housing

satisfaction by rating of home maintenance was statistically significant as shown by X^2 =27.114 with 1 d.f., P <.01.

The residents who were "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation said their homes were maintained very well, while those that were "less satisfied" said their residence was maintained only fairly well or not well.

Home Maintenance

Some families stated a number of reasons why their residence was not maintained very well. Others had plans for improving their residence within the year and over the next five years.

Reasons Residence Is Not Maintained. Ten residents said their home was not maintained well. They were asked the reason it was not. Five percent said the reason was lack of money; nine percent said they did not have enough time, while eight percent said the reasons were beyond their control. Some said the landlord refused to properly maintain the residence or would promise to make repairs but never did so. Some respondents gave more than one reason.

Home Improvements Within the Year. Each respondent was asked if they had the opportunity what home improvements would they make within the year. It was found that 52 percent planned interior improvements, such as new paint,

carpet, hard surface floor coverings, drapes, furniture, interior decorating, kitchen cabinets, appliances, lighing, and fireplace. They also planned to seal air-leaks, and add insulation, central heat and airconditioning. Fifteen percent planned exterior improvements, such as repair window locks, gutters and paint. Twenty-six percent planned to increase the square footage in the home by adding a second story, den, nursery, bathroom, bedroom, laundry area, and foyer.

Home Improvements within Five Years. Each respondent was asked if they had the opportunity what home improvements would they make in the next five years. Twenty-six percent said they would make interior improvements, such as remodeling, adding wallpaper, light fixtures, carpet, fireplace, shutters, built-in furniture, and energy improvements in insulation, weatherstripping, enclosing exterior foyer to act as a buffer from cold or warm temperatures, and add 220 wiring for air conditioning. Fourteen percent said they would make exterior improvements, such as painting, new windows and screens, replace siding with brick, add a roof extension, driveways and sidewalks, storage shed, green house, above ground pool, patio, fence, landscaping and landfill. Twenty-three said they would increase the square footage of their residence by adding a larger den, playroom, another bedroom, bathroom, gameroom,

utility room, and add laundry area indoors. Eleven percent said they would make other improvements such as adding an apartment for extra income or moving.

Extent of Knowledge of Selected Housing Concepts

Each respondent was asked the extent of knowledge they already had on ten selected housing concepts. They were asked if they felt they had much knowledge, some knowledge, or little or no knowledge of the housing concepts. (See Table XLVI)

TABLE XLVI

EXTENT OF KNOWLEDGE OF SELECTED HOUSING CONCEPTS
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Housing Concepts	Much Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Little or No Knowledge
Space for needs	40	43	17
Home Appliances	39	48	13
Kitchen Design	37	44	19
Home Finances	37	44	19
Maintenance	35	41	24
Interior Design	30	48	22
Remodeling	29	39	32
Storage	26	45	29
Landscaping	21	47	32
Saving Energy	20	57	23

Extent of Help from Previous Housing Education

Each respondent was asked the extent of help they have received from previous housing education. They were asked if the previous housing education was very helpful, fairly helpful, or of little or no help. Items were ranked according to extent of help from previous methods of housing education. (See Table XLVII)

TABLE LXIV

EXTENT OF HELP FROM PREVIOUS HOUSING EDUCATION
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Help From Previous Housing Education	Very Helpful	Fairly Helpful	Little or No Help
High Sch. Home Ec.	29	20	13
College Home Ec.	8	3	6
Other Classes	12	2	6
4-H Club	5	8	10
Homemaker Club	8	5	4
Magazines	29	43	9
Books	26	33	8
Television	16	34	25
Radio	6	9	41
Other	3	2	1

Extent of Expressed Needs for Information on Housing Concepts

Each respondent was asked to state the extent of their expressed needs for information on housing concepts. They were asked if they desired much more information on housing concepts, some more information or little or no more information. Items were ranked according to extent of expressed needs for information on housing concepts. (See Table XLVIII)

TABLE LXV

EXTENT OF EXPRESSED NEEDS FOR INFORMATION ON HOUSING CONCEPTS GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Housing Concepts	Much Information	Some Information	Little or No Information
Saving Energy	39	36	25
Storage	35	27	38
Remodeling	34	24	42
Interior Design	34	37	29
Maintenance	33	32	35
Landscaping	32	32	36
Home Finances	26	26	48
Space For Needs	22	34	44
Kitchen Design	22	38	40
Home Appliances	16	41	43

Practicality of Teaching Methods

Each respondent was asked to state the extent of practicality of selected teaching methods. They were asked if the selected teaching methods were very practical, fairly practical, or not practical as a means for receiving housing information. Items were ranked according to practicality of teaching methods. (See Table XLIX)

TABLE XLIX

PRACTICALITY OF TEACHING METHODS
GREATER METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA, 1983

Teahcing Methods	Very Practical	Fairly Practical	Not Practical
Mailout Info.	65	21	14
Newspaper	48	35	17
1-2 Hour Meetings	47	24	29
Television	46	42	12
Telephone	42	25	33
1 Day Workshops	41	23	36
Series of Classes	41	23	36
Home Visits	35	21	44
Homemaker Clubs	30	22	48
Radio	22	41	37

Time of Day for Classes

Seventy respondents said classes would be a practical means of receiving housing information from the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. Each of these respondents were asked if they preferred morning, afternoon or evening classes. Twenty percent said they preferred morning classes, 13 percent said afternoon classes and 37 percent evening classes.

Familiarity with Cooperative Extension Service

Each respondent was asked they were familiar with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service. It was found that 13 percent were very familiar, 19 percent were fairly familiar and 68 percent were not familiar at all.

CHAPTER V

Summary and Conclusions

Situational Statement

The national housing goal of a "decent home and suitable living environment for every American family" was established by Congress as far back as 1949 in the Housing Act. A number of other housing decisions have been made by the government to affirm this goal.

Governmental departments have been established to assist with housing regulation, finance and education. The Cooperative Extension Service is one such educational agency set up by the government in 1914 by the Smith-Lever Act.

To plan, implement and evaluate a housing educational program through the Cooperative Extension Service it is necessary to have a knowledge of the learners, the general population needing a "decent home and suitable living environment", the contemporary society and the current housing situation. Also necessary are the knowledge of the job, the educational philosophy and psychology of teaching of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

The program planning procedure used by the Cooperative Extension Service is based upon the fulfillment of needs of the clientele. Brophy stated, "The result of subjective

evaluation of the degree to which housing needs are met is housing satisfaction" (Brophy, P.268). Factors associated with housing satisfaction were determined to evaluate the degree to which housing needs are met. Housing programs can be planned to fill the gap between the clientele's present level of knowledge of selected housing concepts and the additional knowledge of selected housing concepts they feel is needed to meet their housing needs.

Families have many needs in providing housing with the current housing situation facing contemporary society.

Inflation has driven-up the cost of housing along with the cost of all goods and services. Families are finding it difficult to meet large house notes or rent payments along with increasing costs for energy, insurance and taxes. Housing usually has been the largest single purchase a family makes, and now it seems to be one of the largest expenses of the monthly budget.

Housing is a complicated concern not only because of financial implications, but because most housing-related choices and activities require interaction with government, industry, and community. Housing choices involve many legal transactions.

The complexity of housing, the large financial investment, and the social interactions and psychological well-being that housing holds for the family dictate that

special consideration be given to the teaching of housing.

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of the study was to determine factors associated with housing satisfaction as follows:

1. To relate housing satisfaction to selected characteristics of the residents (family).
2. To relate housing satisfaction to selected physical aspects of the dwelling.
3. To relate housing satisfaction to selected economic aspects of the dwelling.
4. To obtain selected data about housing as a basis for planning future educational programs.

Some specific objectives of the study were to determine respondents knowledge of selected aspects of housing and how such knowledge was obtained, plans for short and long term housing improvements, expressed needs for additional information about housing, and educational methods most preferred by respondents to obtain additional housing information. Also data were obtained concerning their extent of familiarity with the Cooperative Extension Service.

Methodology

Sample. A random sample of 100 respondents was selected from Criss-Cross Directories of the Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area. A proportionate number of

respondents was selected to the population in each zip code area. Streets were selected at random within each zip code area, then households on the selected streets were selected at random.

Data Collected. Data for the study were collected by telephone interviews with the selected respondents, using a structured interview schedule. A choice was presented to the respondent to conduct the interview over the telephone using a prepared interview schedule or to mail it as a questionnaire to the respondent with a self-addressed stamped envelope. The interview schedule contained questions relating to the above listed objectives of the study (See Appendix).

Statistical Test. Since the respondents of this study represented a sample of the total population, it is possible that the differences between the respondents in the sample and the total population were due to sampling error rather than actual differences. In order to control this possibility, the chi-square test was applied to the data.

Also presented were percentages, frequency distributions, and arithmetic means where appropriate.

Findings

Personal Characteristics. Some Characteristics of the respondents were:

1. The mean age was 45.4 years.
2. Most respondents (83 percent) were female.
3. Seventy-four percent had a spouse.
4. Most of the households (63 percent) contained children.
5. The average size per household was 3.2 persons.
6. Most of the respondents (83 percent) had completed high school or beyond.
7. About half (51 percent) were employed, mostly being professional or white collar workers. Others were homemakers, unemployed, and retired persons.
8. The childrens ages were 5 years of less, (35 percent), 6 to 12 years (36 percent) and 13 years or over (39 percent).
9. About one-fourth (24 percent) had annual family incomes under $15,000, 27 percent had $15,000 to $30,000, and 49 percent were over $30,000.
10. Nearly half (44 percent) lived in their present dwelling less than 15 years.

Housing Situations. Some of the housing situations were:

1. Nearly three-fourths (72 percent) lived in a single-family dwelling.
2. Three-fourths (75 percent) owned their residence.
3. Twenty-two percent had one bedroom, 36 percent had two, and 42 percent had three or more.
4. Less than half (41 percent) had one or more guest bedrooms.

5. Nearly three-fourths (72 percent) had only one living area.

6. Nearly three-fourths (71 percent) has a dining room.

7. About three-fifths (61 percent) had two or more bathrooms.

8. About three-fourths (76 percent) had a laundry area.

9. Less than one-fourth (23 percent) had an extra room for hobbies or other family activities.

10. Forty-one percent had a garage, 28 percent a carport, fifty-five percent had enclosed outdoor storage, and fifty-seven percent had a patio.

11. Twelve percent had less than five rooms, 49 percent had five to seven rooms, and 39 percent had eight or more rooms.

12. Storage was very adequate in the residence for:

food	47 percent
kitchen equipment	57 percent
linens	57 percent
drugs and cosmetics	50 percent
regularly worn hanging clothes	55 percent
folded clothes	62 percent
out-of-season clothes	57 percent
outdoor recreation equipment	36 percent
indoor recreation equipment	40 percent
recreational vehicles	15 percent
seasonal items	47 percent
laundry supplies	54 percent
cleaning supplies	51 percent
yard care equipment	46 percent

13. Residence met the family's needs very well for 50 percent, fairly well for 39 percent, and not well for 11 percent.

14. Sixteen percent entertained in their residence often, 48 percent occassionally, 29 percent seldom and seven never.

15. Forty percent were very well satisfied, 39 percent were fairly well satisfied and 21 percent were not well satisfied with their residence when entertaining.

16. Sixty-four percent rated their residence in good condition, 28 percent in fair condition and eight percent in poor condition.

17. Fifty-one percent rated their residence as very well maintained, 39 percent fairly well maintained and ten percent not well maintained.

18. Respondents had much more knowledge on planning space for family's needs (40 percent), home appliances (39 percent), kitchen design (37 percent) and home finances (37 percent).

19. Respondents expressed a need for much more information on saving energy (39 percent), storage (35 percent), remodeling (34 percent) and interior design (34 percent).

20. Methods of teaching rated very practical were mailout information (65 percent), newspaper articles (48 percent), one to two hour meetings (47 percent) and television programs (46 percent).

21. Residences were not maintained very well due to lack of money (five percent), lack of time (nine percent) and reasons beyond the control of residents (eight percent).

22. Within the year fifty-two percent planned to make interior improvements, fifteen percent exterior imporvements and 26 percent planned to increase the square footage of the dwelling.

23. Within five years twenty-six percent planned to make interior improvements, 14 percent exterior improvements, 23 percent planned to increase the square footage of the dwelling and ten percent planned to move.

24. More respondents preferred evening classes (37 percent) over morning classes (20 percent) or afternoon classes (13 percent).

25. Only 13 percent were familiar with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service, compared to 19 percent fairly familiar and 68 percent not familiar.

Housing Costs. Various data were collected concerning economic aspects of housing and are summarized below:

1. About one-fifth (21 percent) of the residences were valued at $40,000 or less, 48 percent were from $41,000 to $80,000, and 24 percent were valued over $80,000.

2. Monthly total housing costs were under $300.00 for 31 percent, $300.00 to $499.00 for 39 percent and $500.00 or more for 30 percent.

Housing Satisfaction. Respondents were asked if they were "very satisfied," "fairly satisfied" or "not satisfied" with their general housing situation. Forty-five percent said they were "very satisfied," 33 percent were "fairly satisfied," and 12 percent were "not satisfied." For further analysis the last two categories were combined and called "less satisfied" (45 percent) for comparison to the "more satisfied" (55 percent).

There were found to be statistically significant differences at $P < .05$ between being "more satisfied" with their overall housing situation and the following independent variables (the exact probability is listed for each):

	P<
The older respondents were "more satisfied"	.01
Households with children were "less satisfied"	.01

	p<
Respondents with younger children were "less satisfied"	.01
The "more satisfied" respondents lived in their residence longer	.01
Home owners were "more satisfied" than renters	.01
Respondents with only one bedroom were "more satisfied"	.01
Respondents with guest bedrooms were "more satisfied"	.01
Respondents very satisfied with storage for food, kitchen equipment, linens, drugs and cosmetics, regularly worn hanging clothes, outdoor recreation equipment, indoor recreation equipment, seasonal items, laundry supplies, and yard care equipment were "more satisfied"	.01
Respondents were "more satisfied" when residence met families' needs	.01
Satisfaction with residence when entertaining led to "more satisfaction"	.01
Residence in good condition led to "more satisfaction"	.01
Residents who maintained their home very well were "more satisfied"	.01
Respondents very satisfied with storage for folded clothing and cleaning supplies were "more satisfied"	.02
The "more satisfied" residents resided in a house	.02
Respondents very satisfied with storage for out-of-season clothing were "more satisfied"	.05
The households with one to two persons were "more satisfied"	.05
Respondents living in more expensive homes over $41,000 were "more satisfied"	.05

	P∠
Respondents who entertained more often in their home were "more satisfied"	.05

Although not significant at the P∠.05 level of probability the following variables were statistically significant at the P∠.10 and are listed for the reader's information. Greater overall housing satisfaction and:

		P
1.	Respondents having a garage with the residence were "more satisfied"	.10
2.	Respondents having a dining room in the residence were "more satisfied"	.10
3.	Respondents employed as a professional were "more satisfied"	.10

Implications for Future Research

1. Further research should be done concerning extent of housing satisfaction and other categories of respondents such as rural and small town residents.

2. More "in depth" studies should be done to try to determine why certain housing or personal characteristics were are were not associated with greater housing satisfaction.

3. Further research should be done to establish more precise categories of respondents concerning extent of housing satisfaction.

4. Finally, a more exhaustive list of independent variables should be used in an effort to better understand housing satisfaction.

Implications for Educational Programs

1. Since living in a residence well maintained and in good condition leads to overall housing satisfaction, programs on home repairs and maintenance should be taught.

2. Since having very adequate storage leads to overall housing satisfaction, programs should be offered on increasing and improving storage areas.

3. More programs should be planned on saving energy, improved storage, remodeling and interior design since more people requested these.

4. Since home ownership leads to overall housing satisfaction, plans should include programs to enable families to view alternatives available to them to purchase a home.

5. Conduct more mass media programs to inform general public of services of the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service.

6. Use more mail-out information, newspaper articles and one to two hour meetings, since more respondents stated these methods were a very practical means of obtaining housing information.

7. More programs should be offered during the evenings, since more respondents preferred them over morning or afternoon classes.

Bibliography

A. BOOKS

Back, Kurt W. Slums, Projects, and People. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1962.

Beyer, Glenn H. Housing: A Factual Analysis. New York: The Macmillan co., 1958.

Bird, R. "Housing Patterns Affecting the Rural South." Quality Housing Environment for Rural Low-Income Families. September, 1975.

Carp, Frances M. A Future for the Aged: Victoria Plaza and Its Residents. Austin, Texas: University Press, 1966.

Criss-Cross Directories. Canton, Ohio: Haines and Company., 1982, pp. 1-11, section 1; 1-522, section 2.

Fredland, Daniel R. Residential Mobility and Home Purchase. Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1974.

Gans, H. J. "Planning for the Everyday Life and Problems of Suburban and New Town Residents." People and Plans, New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Greendale, Alexander and Stanley Knock, Jr., editors. Housing Costs and Housing Needs. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Lewis, Evelyn L. Housing Decisions. South Holland, Illinois: The Goodheart-Willcox, Company, Inc., 1978.

Loomis, Charles P., and chairman. Rural Social Systems and Adult Education. East Lansing, Michigan: The Michigan State College Press, 1953.

Maslow, Abraham. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Mathieu, James T., M. Powell, Robert J. Newcomer, and Thomas O. Byerts. "Housing Preferences and Satisfaction." In Community Planning for an Aging Society. Stroudsberg, Pennsylvania: Dowden, Hutchnson, and Ross, Inc., 1976.

Meyerson, Martin, Barbara Terrett, and William L. C. Wheaton. Housing, People, and Cities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962.

Michelson, David Reuben. The Cities in Tomorrow's World. New York: Julian Messner, New York, 1973.

Morris, Earl W. and Mary Winter. Housing, Family, and Society. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Mueller, Thomas., Alexander Greendale and Stanley F. Knock, Jr. "Issues in Land Use Policies and Housing." Housing Costs and Housing Needs. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976.

Paolucci, Beatrice, Theodore Faiola, and Patricia Thompson. Personal Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

Professional Builder and Apartment Business. 1976 National Consumer Survery on Housing. Chicago, Illinois: Cahness Publishing Company, January 1976.

Rosow, Irving. Social Integration of the Aged. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Sanders, H. C. "The Legal Base, Scope, Functions, and General Objectives of Extension Work." The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1966.

Sternlieb, George. Housing, 1973-1974. New York: AMS Press, 1976.

White, Betty Jo. "Your Role in Housing." Human Shelter/ Family Housing Workbook. Fort Collins, Colorado: Colorado State University, 1976.

Wilner, Daniel M., Rasabelle P. Walkley, Huntington Williams, and Matthew Tayback. The Housing Environment and Family Life: A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Housing on Morbidity and Mental Health. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1962.

B. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Carlson, Jack. National Association of Realtors, News. April 26, 1982.

Census Bureau, Statistical Abstracts, Wash., D.C.:GPO p.436.

Cranz, Galen, and Sam Dyer. Center on Aging and Human Development. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Architectural Research Conference. "Appearance and Noise: How Two Big Dissatisfactions with Congregate Housing Are Evaluated in San Francisco's Housing for the Elderly." Nasville, Tennessee, 1976.

Gelwicks, Louis E., and Robert J. Newcomer. The National Council on the Aging. Planning Housing Environments for the Elderly. Washington D.C., 1974.

Henderson, Arnold. Center on Aging and Human Development. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Architectural Research Conference. "Low-Rent Public Housing for the Elderly: User Satisfaction in Oklahoma Projects." Nashville, Tennesee, 1976.

Killinger, Paul. Home Builders Association of Greater New Orleans. Conference. April 22, 1981.

Lynn, James T. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Housing in the Seventies. Washington, D.C., 1973.

Louisiana Manufactured Housing Association. News-Item. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Vol. VI, No. V, February, 1978.

Manufactured Housing Institute. Quick Facts. Arlington, Virginia, July, 1982.

National Association of Extension Home Economists. Making A Difference All Across the Nation.

National Association of Home Builders. Monthly Report, Economic News Notes. Washington, D. C., April 1976.

National Association of Home Builders, Public Affairs Division. Housing Background. Washington, D. C., February 1982.

Pond, M. A. How Does Housing Affect Health? Public Health Reports. 61 (May 10). 665-672.

Rice, Robert. Associate Dean School of Home Economics, University of Arizona. Annual Conference of American Association of Housing Educators. "Housing Dimensions-Can We Measure Up?" 1977.

Riordan, Dale P. "Reforms in Family Finance: Mortgage Market." Outlook'82. Washington D.C., 1982.

Rohles, Frederick H. Center on Aging and Human Development. Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Architectural Research Conference. "Problems of Habitability of the Elderly in Public Housing." Nashville, Tennessee, 1976.

Schorr, Alvin L. Slums and Social Insecurity, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Division of Research and Statisitics, Research Report No. 1. Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Wells, Helen L., Extension Specialist, Housing. Housing--An Important Consumer Concern. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, November, 1976.

Winter, Mary. Presented at American Home Economics Association Annual Meeting. "Socioeconomic and Demographic Factors Associated with Planning Various Home Improvements." Minneapolis, Minnesota, July, 1976.

Wysocki, Joseph L. Housing Headlines. The Pennsylvania State University, January, 1981; October, 1981; February, 1982; July, 1982; July/August, 1982.

C. JOURNALS

Anderson, Carol. "News--Good Year." Builder, Vol.6, No. 1, (January, 1983) pp. 42-46.

Baskin, Judith F. "Housing Decision of Repeat Homebuyers: Emphasis on the Effects of Taxation." Housing Educators Journal, (1980), pp. 31-35.

Brink, Satya, and Johnston, Kathleen. "Housing Satisfaction-The Concept and Evidence from Home Purchase Behavior". Home Economics Research Journal. Vol. 7, No. 6, (July, 1979) pp. 338-345.

Brophy, A. L. "Self, Role and Satisfaction." Provincetown, Mass.: Genetic Psychology Monographs, 59, (1959) p.268.

Brown, Marjorie. "The teaching of Housing and Home Furnishings in Home Economics." Housing and Society, Vol. 5, No. 2, (1978) pp. 3-16.

Cheshire, Herbert. "It's Official: Census Spots Changing Lifestyles." Housing. Vol. 61, No. 6, (June, 1982) p. 22.

Christie, George. "Economists Forecast Gradual Recovery in 1983." Builder. Vol. 5, No. 12, (December, 1982) pp. 27-28.

Devereaux, William, and Leslie Stockman. "Down-Size." Builder. Vol. 6, No. 2, (February, 1983), pp. 60-64.

Dillman, Don, Kenneth Tremblay, Jr., and Joyce Dillman. "Influence of Housing Norms and Personal Characteristics on Stated Housing Preferences." Housing and Society. Vol. 6, No. 1, (1979) pp. 2-18.

Duncan, Otis, and Beverly Duncan. "Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification." The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 60, No. 5, (March, 1955) pp. 493-503.

Edwards, Carolyn. "Alternative Mortgage Instraments." Family Economics Review, No. 4, (1982) pp. 1-16.

Grootenboer, E. A. "The Relation of Housing to Behavior Disorder." American Journal of Psychiatry. Vol. 119, No. 5, (November, 1962) pp. 469-472.

Hanna, Sherman, and Suzanne Lindamood. " Housing Prefernces of Blacks and Whites in Montgomery, Alabama." Housing and Society. Vol. 6, No. 1, (1979) pp. 39-46.

Harris, Chritine M. "The Measurement of Quality in Housing and Its Relationship to Housing Satisfaction." Housing Educators Journal. (May, 1976) pp. 7-13.

Jacobs, Bary G. "Stronger Thrifts Will Bolster Housing." Builder. Vol. 5, No. 12, (December, 1982) p. 23.

Leagans, J. Paul. "A Concept of Needs." Journal of Cooperative Extension. Vol. 2, (Summer, 1964) pp. 90-93.

Meeks, Carol B., and Francille M. Firebaugh. "Home Maintnance and Improvement Behavior of Owners. Home Economics Research Journal. Vol. 3, No. 2, (December, 1974) pp. 114-129.

Meeuwig, M. Joy. "Housing and Activities of the Elderly." Journal of Home Economics. Vol. 62, No. 8, (October, 1970) pp. 592-597.

Mitchell, Robert E. "Some Social Implications of High Density Housing." American Sociology Review. Vol. 36, (February, 1971). pp. 18-29.

Pickvance, C. G. "Life-Cycle, Housing Tenure, and Intra-Urban Residential Mobility: A Casual Model." The Sociological Review. Vol. 21, No.2 (1973) pp. 279-297.

Pryde, Harry A. "Making Housing Strong Again." Builder. Vol. 6, No. 2, (February, 1983) pp. 79-80.

Rea, Louis M. "Residential Satisfaction and Intraurban Mobilty." Housing and Society Vol. 5, No. 1, (1978) pp. 2-11.

Rogers, Elizabeth, and Stan Nikkel. "The Housing Satisfaction of Large Urban Families." Housing and Society. Vol. 6, No. 2, (1979) pp. 73-87.

Slagh, Luella, and Suzzane Lindamood. "Development and Testing of A High School Housing Unit Based on Student Interests and Needs." Housing and Society. Vol. 5, No. 2, (1978) pp. 23-32.

Smith, Herman J. "First-Time Home Buyers: Outlook for the 80's." Housing and Society. Proceedings (1981), pp.5-8.

Smith, Ruth H., Donna B. Downer, Mildred T. Lynch, and Mary Winter. "Privacy and Interaction Within the Family as Related to Dwelling Space." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 31, No. 3, (August, 1969) pp.559-566.

Solkin, William R. "Ace Markets for 1983." Builder. Vol. 5, No. 12, (December, 1982) p. 25.

"Specs." Builder. Vol. 5, No. 12, (December, 1982) p. 88; Vol. 6, No. 1, (January, 1983) p. 216; Vol. 6, No. 2, (February, 1983) p. 96.

Steidl, Rose E. "User Effort Related to Apartment Design." Home Economics Research Journal. Vol. 9, No. 4, (June 1981) pp. 297-309.

Sumichrast, Michael. "Nowhere to Go But Down." Builder. Vol. 6, No. 1, (January, 1983) p. 4.

Tilly, Charles. "Occupational Rank and Grade of Residence in a Metropolis." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 67, (1961) pp. 323-330.

van Vliet, Willem. "Effects Of Apartment Living on Children: A Critical Examination." Housing Educators Journal. 1980 Conference Proceedings. (1980). pp. 115-121.

Vars, Freda T. "Factors Related to Housing Satisfaction." Journal of Home Economics. Vol. 61, No. 3, (March, 1969) pp. 164-166.

D. PERIODICALS

"Are Housing Costs Going Through the Roof?" 50 Plus. April, 1979, p. 17.

Benson, W. "Why High Prices for Housing?" Workbench. Vol. 36, November, 1979, p. 76-79.

Breckenfeld, G., "Is the One-Family House Becoming a Fossil? Far from It." Fortune, April 1976, pp. 84-89.

Carp, Frances M. "User Evaluation of Housing for the Elderly." The Gerontologist, Vol. 16 April, 1976, p. 102-111.

Christie, George A. "Dodge/Sweet's Construction Outlook: First Update." Architectural Review. Vol 167, April, 1980, pp. 61-63.

Christie, George A. "Dodge/Sweet's Construction Outlook: 1980 Is Not 1975." Architectural Review. Vol. 166, November, 1979, p.65-73.

Doxiadis, Constantinos A. "Ekistics, the Science of Human Settlements." Science, Vol. 170, No. 3956, (October 23, 1970) pp. 393-404.

Fisher, Robert Moore and John W. Graham. "Housing Demand by One-Person Households," Land Economics, Vol.50, No. 2, May, 1974, p. 161-167.

"Gimme Shelter, But Where?" Time, July 23, 1979, p. 66.

"Housing: It's Outasight". Time, September 12, 1977, pp. 50-54, 57.

Hynson, L. M. "Rural-urban Differences in Satisfaction Among the Elderly." Rural Sociology, Vol. 40, No. 1, 1975, pp. 64-66.

"Managing Your Money-Trouble with a Down Payment?" U.S. News and World Report, May 21, 1979, p. 105.

Mintz, Martin M. Director of Technical Services for National Association of Home Builders. "How Reducing Regulations Can Cut Costs." Land Use and Development, April 13, 1981, p. 3.

"Professional Builders" Consumer/Builder Survey on Housing," Professional Builder and Apartment Business. Vol. 42, No. 1, January, 1977, p. 132-151.

"Remodeling Activity Among 8000 Homeowners." Newsweek. 1980.

Scheflen, Albert E. "Living Space in an Urban Ghetto." Family Process, Vol. 10, No. 4, December, 1971, pp. 429-450.

Sussna, Stephen. "Residential Densities or a Fool's Paradise," Land Economics, Vol. 49, No. 1, February, 1973, p. 1-8.

Wagner, W. F. "Round Table: Housing and Community Design for Changing Family Needs." Architectural Review, Vol. 166, No. 13, October, 1979, pp. 97-98.

Wagner, W. F. "Why the Changing Housing Market Means Marketing Opportunities for Architecture?" Architectural Review, Vol. 165, March, 1979, p. 13.

E. NEWSPAPERS

Calonius, L. Erik. "Home, Sweet Home." Wall Street Journal, October 19, 1982, p. 1,22.

"FHA and VA Ceiling on Mortgage Rates is Lowered to 12%." Wall Street Journal. November 15, 1982, p. 24.

Stuart, Lettice. "U. S. Study: Cut Costs by Trimming Red Tape." The Times Picayune/The States Item, February 14, 1981, p.4.

F. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Angell, W. J. "Resources Related to Housing of the Elderly in Rural Nonfarm Households." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State University, 1972.

Bayler, Gretchen. "Factors which Influence the Successful Attainment of Home Ownership." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1977.

Crawford, Linda. "Housing Condition and Expressed Housing Satisfaction of Elderly Residents in Rural Florida." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Florida State University, 1978.

Downer, Donna Beth. "The Influence of Attitudes on the Relationship Between the House and Adult Social Activity." Unpublished Masters Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1967.

Hauber, Paula. "Elderly Persons' Assessment of Rural Rental Housing in Northwest Missouri." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Colorado State University, 1978.

Jarosz, Susan. "Explorations Into the Rental Apartment Market." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of North Carolina, 1978.

Moore, Marilyn. "Housing Conditions and Housing Satisfaction of Older rural Households in Two Low-Income Counties of Virginia." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1976.

Phebus, Charlotte E. "The Development of an Instrument for Evaluating Multi-Family Housing." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Purdue University, 1970.

Reardon, Lanita Carter. "Factors Influencing the Initiative to Seek Help with Housing and Management Problems." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Auburn University, 1978.

Recchie, Martha R. "Physical Facilities That Contribute to Safety and Independence and the Satisfaction of Women Residents of Housing for the Elderly." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1973.

Rupe, Carol E. "Furniture Utilization in Apartment Living." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oregon State University, 1978.

Simpson, Minnie C. "The Effectiveness of Two Types of Public Housing, High-Rise and Garden Apartments in Meeting Selected Needs of the Aging in Knoxville, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1969.

Taylor, Jo Ann. "The Relationship of Dwelling Space to Family Activity Performance and Family Solicarity." Unpublished Doctor's Disseration, The Pennsylvania State University, 1978.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

FOR

HOUSING STUDY

METROPOLITAN NEW ORLEANS AREA

1982

Schedule #_____
Zip Code _____

1. How long have you lived in your present place of residence? _____

2. Do you live in a

a. house	
b. apartment	
c. duplex	
d. mobile home	
e. other (specify)	

3. Do you own or rent your home?

a. own	
b. rent	
c. other (specify) _____	

4. I would like for you to name the rooms in your home and the number of each. Do you have

a. regularly used bedrooms	
b. guest bedrooms	
c. living room/den	
d. kitchen	
e. dining room	
f. bathroom	
g. laundry area	
h. other rooms (specify)	
i. garage	
j. carport	
k. enclosed outdoor storage	
l. patio	
Total	

5. Would you say the storage available in your home for the following articles is very adequate, fairly adequate or not adequate?

	Where Stored	Adequate very	fairly	not
a. food				
b. kitchen equipment (utensils, dishes, etc.)				
c. linens				
d. drugs and cosmetics				
e. regularly worn hanging clothing				
f. folded clothing				
g. out-of-season clothing				
h. outdoor recreation equipment (bicycles, barbecue grills,etc.)				
i. indoor recreation equipment (games, books, etc.)				
j. recreation vehicles (campers, boats, etc.)				
k. seasonal supplies (Christmas decorations, etc.)				
l. laundry supplies (soiled clothes, detergent, etc.)				
m. cleaning supplies and equipment				
n.yard care equipment				

6. How would you rate the overall condition of your home?
   a. good
   b. fair
   c. poor

7. How satisfied are you with this place of residence?
   a. mostly satisfied
   b. fairly satisfied
   c. mostly unsatisfied

8. How well do you feel your place of residence meets your family's needs and requirements?
   a. very well
   b. fairly well
   c. not well

9. Do you entertain in your home?
   a. often
   b. occasionally
   c. seldom
   d. never

10. How well satisfied are you with this place in entertaining people?
    a. very well
    b. fairly well
    c. not well

11. You say not well, then what would you say is the problem?

_____

_____

_____

12. How well do you feel your place is maintained?
    a. very well
    b. fairly well
    c. not well

13. If your residence is not maintained very well, can you give me the main reason it is not? _____

_____

14. If you had the opportunity to improve one thing in your home this year, what would it be? _____

_____

_____

15. What would you like to improve within the next five years? _____

_____

_____

I have a list of concepts or situations which might be used in providing housing for your family. The next two questions refer to this list.

16. First, I would like to know how much knowledge do you feel you have about each of these concepts or situations.

17. Second, how much information do you feel you need or would like to have on any of these concepts to improve your family's housing?

	Question 16			Question 17		
	Knowledge			Information needed		
	much	some	little or none	much	some	little or none
a. planning your home to include space to meet your family needs						
b. kitchen design						
c. household appliances						
d. saving energy in the home						
e. housing finances						
f. home repairs and maintenance						
g. remodeling						
h. improving & building storage						
i. interior design & decoration						
j. landscaping around the home						

18. How helpful have each of the following sources of information been to you in learning about housing?

	very helpful	fairly helpful	little or no help	does not apply
a. high school home economics class				
b. college home economics class				
c. other groups or classes (specify)				
d. 4-H club				
e. Extension homemaker club				
f. homemaker magazines				
g. homemaking books & booklets				
h. TV shows				
i. radio programs				
j. other (specify)				

19. I teach home economics with the Extension division of LSU. I would like to know to what extent are you familiar with our division, the LSU Cooperative Extension Service.

very familiar ☐
fairly familiar ☐
not familiar ☐

20. The Extension Service uses several methods to get education information to the public. How practical are each of the following methods for you personally?

	very	Practical somewhat	not
a. radio			
b. television			
c. newspaper			
d. mailout information			
e. telephone			
f. home visits by the Extension Home Economist			
g. one-two hour meetings or demonstrations			
h. one-day workshops			
i. series of classes			
j. Homemaker club meetings			

21. You said classes would be practical for you. Which is the best time for you to attend a class? Would you say in the

morning	
afternoon	
evening	

22. For the purpose of this study, I am trying to determine how much of a family's income is spent on their housing.

About how much do you spend for each of the following housing costs?

	per month	or year
a. house note		
b. or rent		
c. electricity		
d. gas		
e. water		
f. sewerage		
g. garbage pick-up		
h. mortgage insurance		
i. liability insurance		
j. comprehensive insurance		
k. property taxes		
l. other (specify)		
Total		

23. Would you estimate the approximate market value of this house? _____

24. In terms of getting information about this house, we would like to get some information about the family living in this household.

	Sex	Age	Education	Occupation (if employed)
Self				
Spouse				
Children				
Others (Relationship)				

25. Do you happen to know approximately your family's yearly income? _____

Would you say

Under $15,000	
$15,000 - $20,000	
$20,001 - $25,000	
$25,001 - $30,000	
$30,001 - $35,000	
$35,001 - $40,000	
Over $40,000	

VITA

Donlene Ann McDonald was born September 5, 1940, in New Orleans, Louisiana. She graduated from John McDonogh Senior High School in June, 1958. In June, 1959 she married Dennis Lee Butler. They have three sons, Dennis Jr., Dean, and Donald.

She received her Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics Education from the University of Southwestern Louisiana in January, 1962. The Master of Science degree in Extension Education from Louisiana State University was awarded in May, 1968.

In February, 1962, she began her training as Assistant Home Demonstration Agent in Lafayette Parish. Following her training she was assigned to Iberia Parish where she worked until September, 1963 when they moved to New Orleans.

In December, 1964 she was reemployed with the Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service as Assistant Home Demonstration Agent in Plaquemines Parish. In July, 1967 she was promoted to Associate Home Demonstration Agent and by July, 1970 to Home Economist, the position currently held. In september, 1975 she was appointed parish chairman for the Plaquemines staff.

During the summer of 1962 she first entered Louisiana State University graduate school to pursue the Master of Science Degree in Extension Education. In 1975 she began

advanced study at Louisiana State University. During the summer of 1977, course work at Virginia Polytechnic Institute was taken in housing. The Louisiana Cooperative Extension Service granted sabbatical leave in 1980 to complete course work toward the Doctor of Education degree.

EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Donlene Ann McDonald Butler

Major Field: Extension Education

Title of Thesis: Factors Associated with Housing Satisfaction, Greater Metropolitan New Orleans Area, 1983

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

April 28, 1983